MITHILĀ INSTITUTE GRANTHAMĀLĀ

3. STUDIES NO. 1

Copies of this Volume, postage paid, can be had of the Director, Mithilā Institute, Darbhanga, on receipt of Rs. 17/8/- either by M. O. or Postal Order.

Printed by Bhola Nath Mishra Acharya at Sudhakar Press, Lakshamisagar, Darbhanga, and Published by Dr. P. L. Vaidya, Director, Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning, Darbhanga.

HISTORY OF MITHILA

(Circa 3000 B.C.—1556 A.D.)

By

Upendra Thakur, M. A., D. Phil. (Cal.)
D. Litt. Research Scholar
Mithilā Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning, Darbhanga

With a Foreword by

Dr. J. N. Banerjea, M. A. Ph. D.
Carmichael Professor and Head of the Department of Ancient Indian History and Culture, Calcutta University

MITHILA INSTITUTE, DARBHANGA
1956

THE GOVERNMENT OF BIHAR established the Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning at Darbhanga in 1951 with the object, *inter-alia*, to promote advanced studies and research in Sanskrit learning, to bring together the traditional Pandits with their profound learning and the modern scholars with their technique of research and investigations, to publish works of permanent value to scholars. This Institute is one of the five others planned by this Government as a token of their homage to the tradition of learning and scholarship for which ancient Bihar was noted. Apart from the Mithila Institute, three others have been established and have been doing useful work during the last three or four years—Nalanda Institute of research and Post-Graduate Studies in Buddhist learning and Pali at Nalanda, K. P. Jaisawal Research Institute at Patna, and the Bihar Rashtra Bhasha Parishad for research and advanced studies in Hindi at Patna. In the establishment of the Mithila Institute the State Government received a generous donation from the Maharajadhiraja of Darbhanga for construction of the building on a plot of land also donated by him.

2. As part of this programme of rehabilitating and re-orientating ancient learning and scholarship, the editing and publication of this volume has been undertaken with the co-operation of scholars in Bihar and outside. The Government of Bihar hope to continue to sponsor such projects and trust that this humble service to the world of scholarship and learning would bear fruit in the fulness of time.

FOREWORD

IT is my privilege to write this foreword to the *History of Mithilā* written by Dr. Upendra Thakur. Mithilā is an ancient land, mainly famous for its many-sided cultural achievements. There was hitherto no full, systematic and elaborate account of Mithilā, though some previous scholars had shed light on particular aspects of the ancient and mediaeval history of the country. But these works were comparatively few in number, and I am glad that it is one of my former students who has striven to remove this long-felt want. When the author came to me, some time after taking his M. A. degree, for a suggestion about the topic of his research, I told him to take up the scientific study of the political and cultural history of his own country. It is gratifying to me that he accepted my suggestion, and devoted himself whole-heartedly to the pursuit of this subject. He worked ceaselessly with a great deal of earnestness, and I had the privilege of seeing him at his work from time to time. His efforts, I am glad to say, have been crowned with success. Dr. Thakur has done useful service to his own home-land, for which the scholars of his country and outside should be thankful to him. He has been critical and scientific in his approach to the various problems connected with his work. I have no doubt that his painstaking and scholarly work will receive due appreciation from the learned historians and Indologists of India and abroad.

—*J. N. Banerjea*

Calcutta
30. 11. 55

PREFACE

I have long been thinking about collecting materials for a book on the general history of Mithilā, mostly in its political and cultural aspects. Some scholars have made their contributions to it. Monmohan Chakravarti's article on the "History of Mithilā During the Pre-Moghul Period" (JASB, 1915, N. S.), though a brilliant piece of research, lacks certain very important features, and misinterprets some historical facts and traditions as regards the fixation of dates of events. Dr. Jayaswal's "contributions to the History of Mithilā" (JBORS, Vols. IX & X), deal mainly with Nānyadeva, the founder of the Karṇāṭa or Simrāon dynasty (1098 A. D.) of Mithilā, and his time. S. N. Singh's "History of Tirhut" (1915) is a notable contribution. The book was, however, written long ago and our knowledge about the subject has advanced a great deal since then. Moreover, only passing references to personalities and events in Mithilā-history are made in this work. Dr. R. C. Majumdar's highly informative article on Nānyadeva and his time (IHQ., Vol. VII, 1931) deals fully with Nānyadeva and it corrects some of the errors and confusions made by Dr. Jayaswal in his articles. Maithila scholars—particularly Mm. Paramesvara Jhā (Mithilā-Tattva-Vimarśa in Maithilī), Mm. Mukunda Jhā

(Mithilā-bhāṣāmaya Itihāsa in Maithilī), Ras Behari Lal Das (Mithilā-Darpaṇa in Hindī) and others—have no doubt made their valuable contributions, but their works lack historical approach to and scientific treatment of the subject concerned.

We have also stray references and a few chapters scattered here and there in various historical journals and works—for example, G. A. Grierson's articles in different volumes of Indian Antiquary (XIV, XVIII, XXVIII, etc.) and the journals of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal ; John Beam's article (IA., IV) ; Dr. H. C. Ray Chaudhuri's chapters on the Janaka dynasty (Political History of Ancient India) ; Prof. R. K. Chaudhuri's articles in different journals and others dealing with one aspect or another. None of these works can claim to be full and comprehensive, so far as the political and cultural history of Mithilā is concerned. Moreover, the cultural aspects—social, economic, religious, and literary—remain practically untouched, though in some of the recent works -e.g., Dr. J. K. Mishra's "History of Maithilī Literature, Vol. I"—only one aspect relating to the growth and development of the Maithilī language and literature has been dealt with ; Monmohan Chakravarti's "contributions to the History of Smṛti in Bengal and Mithilā" (JASB. 1915, N. S.) is a praiseworthy step in this direction ; but their study in context of the social, economic, and religious developments in the country lacks fuller treatment. In the present work I have, therefore, attempted to deal with most of these aspects in the background of chronological and political history of Mithilā.

In Chapter I, I have given an idea of the historical and geographical position of Mithilā, its foundation and different interpretations of its mythical names, and the various sources from which informations relating to the history of Mithilā have been gleaned. In Chapter II, I have tried to present a full picture of the Janaka dynasty, the later Videhas, their fall, and the political, social, economic and religious conditions and philosophical attainments during the period. In Chapter III, I have given a review of the Vajjian Confederacy, of which Mithilā or Videha was a significant component, in the light of up-to-date materials with particular emphasis on the social and cultural aspects of the period. In Chapter IV, I have dealt with the subjugation of Mithilā by various outside powers coming one after another from different parts of India, for a period of about fourteen hundred years. In Chapter V, I have dwelt at length on the establishment and achievements of the Karṇāṭa or Simrāon dynasty which reinstated Mithilā on the map of independent States. This was also a period of great literary and philosophical attainments that left its ineffaceable marks on the Sanskrit-learning. In Chapter VI, I have dealt with the age of the Oinavāra Brāhmaṇa-kings who ruled over Mithilā, after the fall of the Karṇāṭa dynasty, though politically they were to a great extent subjugated to the Muslim Emperors of Delhi. In Chapter VII, I have discussed the various cultural aspects of the people in Mediaeval Mithilā. Besides political, literary, religious and economic conditions during the period, I have taken particular notice of the outstanding social reforms introduced by Harisiṃhadeva, the last king of the Karṇāṭa line, and evils accruing therefrom. I have criticised

them frankly and sincerely, of which I, as a child of the soil, can claim to have the first-hand knowledge. My approach to this problem has been thoroughly unbiassed, corroborated by facts. The dying evils of this age-old system can be seen in Mithilā of this date. In Chapter VIII, a chronological review of the Muslim conquest of Mithilā has been presented.

This work is substantially the thesis approved by the University of Calcutta for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in January 1955. I must express my gratefulness to the authorities of the Calcutta University for granting me facilities to carry on this research work.

In preparation of this volume I owe a deep debt of gratitude to my respected teacher, guide and supervisor Prof. Dr. J. N. Banerjea, M. A. Ph. D., who not only suggested this subject to me but kindly supervised this work and gave me numerous valuable suggestions. Moreover, he has increased my debt to him by kindly contributing Foreword to this book.

My thanks are also due to Mm. Prof. V. V. Mirashi, M. A., Mm. Dr. Umesh Mishra, M. A., D. Litt., Prof. S. K. Saraswati, Calcutta University, Prof. Lalita Prasad Sukul, M. A., Calcutta University and Dr. Laksman Jha, Ph. D. (London) and several others for numerous suggestions and help.

I express my profound gratitude to my friends Śrī R. P. Shrivastava, M. Com. and Śrī Bagishwar Jha B. A. (Hons.) who helped me in all possible ways. I owe much to them.

I am exceedingly grateful to Dr. P. L. Vaidya, M. A., D. Litt. (Paris) Director, Mithilā Institute, Darbhanga,

for his help in getting this work included among the Publications of the Institute, and making useful suggestions.

My friends Śrī Jageshwar Mahto, M. A., Śrī Munish Kumar Pandey, M. A., Śrī Mangalpati Jha, M. A. and Śrī Umakant Thakur, M. A. deserve thanks for helping me in preparing the index. To Śrī Bholanath Mishra, Acharya, Proprietor, Sudhakar Press, Darbhanga, and his staff I am grateful for their taking special interest in the printing of this volume.

I am sorry to see some mis-prints in this volume. I crave indulgence of the learned scholars for these lapses for which I alone am responsible.

Upendra Thakur

Mithilā Institute,
Darbhanga
7th December, 1955

ABBREVIATIONS AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

AGI—Cunningham's Ancient Geography of India (*Ed. by* S. N. Majumdar)

AHI—An Advanced History of India *by* Majumdar, Raychaudhuri & Datta

AIE—Ancient Indian Education *by* R. K. Mookerji

AIHT—Ancient Indian Historical Tradition *by* F. E. Pargiter

Ain—
AK— } —Ain-i-Akbari *by* Abul Fazal, *Trans. by* Jarret

AIN—Ancient Indian Numismaties *by* D. R. Bhandarkar

Ait. Brā.—Aitareya Brāhmaṇa

Allahabad University Studies......

Amarakoṣa—*Ed. by* S. Lefmann

Ancient India—*by* E. J. Rapson

Ancient India—*by* S. K. Aiyangar

Aṅguttara Nikāya—*Ed. by* R. Morris & E. Hardy

An Introduction to Maithilī Language—*by* G. A. Grierson

Annals, BORI—Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute

Antiquities of India—*by* L. D. Barnett

Artha—Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra, *Ed. by* Sam Sātrī

As. Soc. Ms.
ASB. Ms. } —Asiatic Society of Bengal, Manuscripts

ASI, ASIAR, ASR—Archaeological Survey of India, Annual Reports

AV—Atharvaveda

Badāoni—Makhzan-i-Afghani, Vol. I, *by* Al Badāoni, *Trans. by* Dorn, Pts. I-II

Bāṅgalāra Itihāsa, Vol. I—*by* R. D. Banerji

Baṅgīya Sāhitya Pariṣada Patrikā......

B. C. Law Volume, Pt. I.. .. .. ..

Bḍ.—Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa

Beal—Buddhist Records of the Western World *by* S. Beal

Bhāg—Bhāgavata Purāṇa Ed. by Bournouf

Bhāratīya Itihāsa kī Rūparekhā—*by* Jayacandra Vidyālaṅkāra

Bhaṭṭikāvya-ṭīkā—(MS. Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal)

Bomb. Gaz.—Bombay Gazetteer

Bṛh. Up.—Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, *Ed. by* E. Roer (SBE. XV)

Briggs—Ferishta (History of the Rise of the Mohammadan Power, Vol. I)

Br. Mus. Cat—British Museum Catalogue

Buch—Economic Life in Ancient India, Vols. I-II *by* Buch

Buddha—H. Oldenberg

Buddha-Carita—*by* Aśvaghosa

Buddhaghosa—*by* B. C. Law

Buddhist India—*by* T. W. Rhys Davids

CAI—Chronology of Ancient India *by* S. N Pradhan

Car. Lec.—Carmichael Lectures, 1918 *by* D. R. Bhandarkar

CASR—Cunningham's Archaeological Survey Reports

Cat. Buddh Skt. Mss.—Catalogue of the Buddhist-Sanskrit Manuscripts *Ed. by* C. Bendall

Cat. Skt. Mss.—Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts (in the Library of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal)

Catalogue of Indian Museum Coins—*by* Bourdillon

CDG—Champaran District Gazetteer

Chāndoga-pariśiṣṭa—*by* Nārāyaṇa (Ms. Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal)

Chānd. Up.—Chāndogya Upaniṣad

CHI—Cambridge History of India, Vol. I, *Ed. by* Rapson

Chronicles of the Pathan Kings of Delhi - *by* Thomas

CII—Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum Vol. I. *by* Hultzsch & Vol. III *by* J. F. Fleet,

Coins of Ancient India—J. Allan

Com. Vol.—Commemoration Volume

Corporate Life—Corporate Life in Ancient India *by* R. C. Majumdar (1st & 2nd Editions)

CPMDN / Nepal Notices / Nepal Cat. } Catalogue of the Palm-Leaf and Selected Mss. belonging to the Durbar Library, Nepal *by* H. P. Sāstrī, with a Historical Introduction by Prof. C. Bendall

Cowell—Jātakas, *Trans. by* Cowell

CR.—Calcutta Review

D. R. Bhandarkar Volume-Law, Pt. II

Das—Mithilā-Darpaṇa *by* R. L. Das

DDG—Darbhanga District Gazetteer

Development of Hindu Iconography—*by* J. N. Baṇerjea

DHNI—Dynastic History of Northern India, Vol. I *by* H. C. Ray

Dialogues—Dialogues of the Buddha *by* Rhys Davids

DKA—Dynasties of the Kālī Age *by* Pargiter

DKM--The Decline of the kingdom of Magadha *by* B. P. Sinha

Dowson—A Classical Dictionary of Hindu Mythology *by* Dowson

DPPN—Dictionary of Pālī Proper Names (Malalasekera)

Early History of the Dekkan—by R. G. Bhandarkar

EHI—Early History of India (3rd & 4th Editions) by V. A. Smith

EI—Epigraphia Indica

Elliot—History of India (8 Volumes) by Elliot

Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics (New York, 1921)

Fausball—Jātakas *Ed.* by Fausball

Gar—Garuḍa Purāṇa, Bombay, 1906

Gauḍalekhamāla—*Ed.* by R. P. Canda

Gauḍarājamālā—*Ed.* by R. P. Canda

Gauḍavaho—*Ed.* by S. P. Pandita, Re-edited by N. B. Utgikar

Gautama—Nyāya-Sūtras of Gautama, *Edited* by J. Tarka-pañcānana

Gilgit Mss.—*Ed.* by Nalinākṣa Datt

HAIB—Some Historical Aspects of the Inscriptions of Bengal by B. C. Sen

HAL—History of Ancient Literature by Max Muller

HB—History of Bengal, Vol. I edited by R. C. Majumdar & Vol. II edited by J. N. Sarkar

HBLL—History of Bengali Language and Literature by D. C. Sen

HC--Hindu Civilisation by R. K. Mookerji

HIL--History of Indian Literature by A. Weber

Hindu View of Art—by Mulkraj Anand

Historical Gleanings--Taxila as a Seat of Learning in Sanskrit and Pāli Literature by B. C. Law

History and Culture of the Indian People, Vol. I--The Vedic Age and Vol. II—The Age of Imperial Unity Edited by R. C. Majumdar & A. D. Pusalker

History of Indian and Indonesian Art--by A. K. Coomarswamy

History of Indian Logic--by S. C. Vidyābhūṣaṇa

History of North-Eastern India--by R. G. Basak

Hist. Skt. Lit.--History of Sanskrit Literature, Vol. I by C. V. Vaidya

HK--History of Kanauj by R. S. Tripathi

HMHI—History of Mediaeval Hindu India by C. V. Vaidya

HML--History of Maithilī Literature, Vol. I, by J. K. Mishra

Homage--Homage to Vaiśālī (Compiled)

HP--Hindu Polity (1st & 2nd Editions) by K. P. Jayaswal

HV--Harivaṃśa Brāhmanical, Edited by R. Kinjawadekar and Jaina Edited by W. Geiger, PTS., 1908)

IA—Indian Antiquary

IB—Inscriptions of Bengal

IC—Indian Culture

IHQ—Indian Historical Quarterly

Imp. Gaz. Ind.—Imperial Gazetteer of India

I. O. Ms. }
Ind. off. Ms. } India Office Manuscripts

I. O. Cat—India Office Catalogue *Edited* by Eggeling

Ind. Stud.—Indische Studien by A. Weber

Indian Museum Coins—Rodgers

Indian Philosophy, Vols. I-II—by S. Radhakrishnan
India's Past—by A. A. Macdonell
Invasion of India—by J. W. MacCrindle
Itihāsa-praveśa—by Jayacandra Vidyālaṅkāra
J—Jātaka
Jaim. Up. Brā.—Jaiminī Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa
JASB (N. S.) —Journal of Asiatic Society of Bengal (New Series)
JBBRAS—Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society
JBORS—Journal of the Bihar & Orissa Research Society
JBRS—Journal of the Bihar Research Society
JDL—Journal of the Department of Letters, Calcutta University
Jha. Com. Vol.—Ganganatha Jha Commemoration Volume
Jha M.—Mithilā-bhāṣāmaya-Itihāsa by Mm. Mukund Jha
Jha P.—Mithilā-tattva-vimarśa by Mm. Parameshwaɪ Jha
JIH—Journal of Indian History
JNSI—Journal of the Numismatic Society of India
Journal of the Manchester Oriental Society......
JRAS—Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland
JRASB—Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal
K. B. Pathak Commemoration Volume ....
Kalpa-Sūtra—*Edited* by Jacobi, SBE. Oxford, 1892
Kauś Brā.—Kauśiṭakī Brāhmaṇa
Kauś. Up.—Kauśiṭakī Upaniṣad
Karṇāṭa Śabdānuśāna—*Edited* by Lewis
Kāt. Śrau. Sūtra.—Kātyāyana Śrauta Sūtra
Kāvya-prakāśa-viveka—by Śrīdhara Thākura (Ms. Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal)

Kīrttilatā—*Edited* by Mm. Haraprasad Sāstrī, Calcutta and by B. R. Saksena, Nāgarī Pracāraṇī Sabhā Saṃsakaraṇa, Kāśī

Kṛtya-kalpataru--by Lakṣmīdhara (Ms. Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal)

Kṣatriya Tribes--Some Kṣatriya Tribes in Ancient India by B. C. Law

KT—Khulāsat-ut-Tawārīkh by Mahārājā Kalyan Singh in different Vols. of JBORS.

La. Saṃ. / LS. } Lakṣmaṇasena Saṃvat

Le Mahāvastu—*Edited* by E. Senart

Le Nepal Vols. I-II—by Sylvain Levi

Life of Buddha—by Rockhill

Liṅga vārtika—by Jayasiṃha (MS. Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal)

Linguistic Survey of India, Vol. V, Pt. II—by Grierson

Mahāgovinda Suttanta—(Sumaṅgala-vilāsinī, Commentary on the Dīgha-Nikāya, *Edited* by T. W. Rhys Davids, PTS. 1886)

Mahāvagga--

Maithilī Chrestomathy—by G. A. Grierson

Manu--Manusmṛti (Mānavadharmaśāstra, *Edited* by G. Buhler)

Manual of Buddhism—by H. Kern

Mārg--English Quarterly, *edited* by Mulkraj Anand

MASB--Memoirs of the Asiatic Society of Bengal

MASI—Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India

Mbh--Mahābhārata (Critical Edition, Poona)

MDG—Muzaffarpur District Gazetteer

Men and Thought in Ancient India--by R. K. Mookerji

Mith. Mss. Cat.--Mithilā Manuscripts Catalogue, *edited* by K. P. Jayaswal & A. P. Śāstrī

Mithilā--(Maithilī Weekly, published from Darbhanga)

Mithilā-Mihira--- (Mithilāṅka, 1936, published from Darbhanga)

M-M—Vidyāpati, Edited by Mitra and Majumdar

Monier-Williams--Sanskrit-English-Dictionary

Modern Review--English Monthly, published from Calcutta

MS.--Manuscript

MSJ / AMSJ } Ashutosh Mookerji Silver Jubilee Volume

MV.--Mahāvaṃśa, *edited* by W. Geiger, PTS, London, 1908

NHIP--A New History of the Indian People, Vol. VI, Edited by R. C. Majumdar & A. S. Altekar

Notices---Notices of Sanskrit Manuscripts, Edited by R. L. Mitra

Origin of the Bengali Script--by R. D. Banerji

Padāvali--Vidyāpati's Padāvali, (Darbhanga & Calcutta Editions)

Pālas of Bengal (1st & 2nd Editions)--by R. D. Banerji

Pañca. Brā.--Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa

Pāṇini--Pāṇini's Aṣṭādhyāyī

Pañjī--Pañjī-Prabandha

PASB--Proceedings, Asiatic Society of Bengal

People of India--by Risley

PHAI--Political History of Ancient India (4th, 5th & 6th editions) by H. C. Ray Chaudhuri

Prabhākara-Mīmāṃsā--*Edited* by Ganganatha Jha

Proc.—Proceedings
PTS—Pali Text Society
PUJ--Patna University Journal
Puruṣa-Parīkṣā--*Edited* by Candra Jha and *Trans.* by Grierson—"The Test of Man."
Pūrva-mīmāṃsā--Svarasvami's Commentary
QJAHRS--Quarterly Journal of the Andhra Historical Research Society
R. Bhandarkar Report for 1883-84
Rām.--Vālmīki-Rāmāyaṇa ; *Trans.* by Griffith
RASB. Palm-Leaf--Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, Palm Leaf
RC.--Ṛgvedic Culture by A. C. Das
Religion and Society--by S. Radhakrishnan
Rockhill--Life of Buddha by Rockhill
RR--Rājanīti-Ratnākara by Caṇḍeśvara Thākura, *Edited* by K. P. Jayaswal
RS--Riyazu-s-Salatin by Ghulam Husain Salim, *Trans.* by A. Abdus Salim
Rv.--Ṛgveda
Śabda-kalpadruma--by Puruṣottamadeva
Saṃyutta-Nikāya--*Edited* by Leon Freer, PTS. London, 1884-88.
Sans Coll. Cat. –Sanskrit Collection Catalogue, *Edited* by A. B. Keith
Sanskrit Texts—by J. Muir
Sarasvati Bhavana Studies .. .. ..
Śat. Brā.--Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa
SBE--Sacred Books of the East
Science and Philosophy of Religion—by Svāmī Vivekānanda
Select Inscriptions, Vol. 1 —*Edited* by D. C. Sircar

Singh—History Tirhut by S. N. Singh
Siyar—Seir-ul-Mutkherin, Vols I–II—by Gholam Hossain Khan *Trans.* by Raymond
Social History of Kāmarūpa—by N. N. Vasu
Songs of Vidyāpati—by Subhadra Jha
TA—Tabakat-i-Akbari
Taitt. Brā.—Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa
Taitt. Saṃ.—Taittirīya Saṃhitā
Tāṇḍya Brā.—Taṇḍya Brāhmaṇa
Tārānātha—*Trans.* by F. A. Von Schiefner
Tārīkh-i-Firoz Shahi—*Trans.* Elliot, Vo
Tibetan Dulva
Todd—Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan by Todd
Tribes in Ancient India—by B. C. Law
Triveda—Pre-Mauryan History of Bihar by D. S. Triveda
TS.—Tabakat-i-Nāsirī
Uvāsagadasāo—*Edited* by Hoernle
Vā.—Vāyu Purāṇa
Vāj. Sam. / Vājas. Saṃ. } Vājasaneyī Saṃhitā
Vedānta Philosophy—by MaxMuller
VI—Vedic Index, Vols. I–II by Macdonell and Keith
Vidyāpati Thākura—by Mm. Umesha Mishra
Vinaya Texts—*Edited* by H. Oldenberg & T. W. Rhys-Davids, SBE. Oxford, 1881–85
VR—Varṇa-Ratnākara, *Edited* by S. K. Chatterji & Shrikant Mishra, Calcutta
VS.—Vikrama Saṃvat
Vṣ.—Viṣṇu Purāṇa (in 5 vols.) *edited* by H. H. Wilson
Watters—On Yuan Chwang's by Watters
Wilson—Sanskrit-English-Dictionary by Wilson

CONTENTS

CHAPTER VI

The Oinavāras

(Cir. 1353 A D. --- 1526 A. D.)

CHAPTER VII

Life and Condition of the people

(1097 A. D. --- 1526 A. D.)

CHAPTER VIII

The Age of the Muslim Conquest

(1200 A. D.--1556 A. D.)

PART I

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

THERE are few regions of India possessing an ancient civilisation, about which we have less definite historical information than the region north of the Gaṅgā, variously known as Videha, Tīrabhukti, or (after the name of its capital) Mithilā. Neither the work of Prinsep nor that of C. M. Duff attempts a dynastic list for this country[1]. Its history does not centre round feats of arms, but round courts given to higher persuits of learning. It was in the halls of the city of Mithilā, the site of which is not indentified as yet, that the great and unparalleled philosophical discussions ever attempted in the history of human thought and culture, were held. It was from the battlements of Simrāon that Harisiṃha, the last of the Simrāon dynasty, long defied the arms of the Muslim conquerors[2]. The extant remains of the cities of ancient kings remind us of their glorious history. No systematic attempt at presenting an outline of the political and cultural history of this land has been made so far. Scholars, indigenous and foreign, including the local Maithila Paṇḍitas, have no doubt made valuable contributions to its history, but the information

1. JASB., 1903, Pt. I. p. 18
2. Ibid Pt. IV. pp. 121—22

furnished by them is meagre. The endeavour of the Maithila scholars, though sincere, lacks critical and historical approach to the problem. What is required is a scientific treatment of the subject. All the same, the information furnished by them supplies us with valuable historical data.

THE LAND

Mithilā, the country of the Maithilas (Videha, Tīrabhukti or modern Tirhut) is the name for the tract lying between 25°28′ and 26°52′ N. lat. and between 84°56′ and 86°46′ E. long.[1]. It is bounded on the north by the Himālaya, and on the east, south and west by the rivers Kośī (Kauśikī), Gaṅgā and Gaṇḍakī respectively. It comprised the present districts of Champāran, Muzaffarpur and Darbhanga, parts of the districts of Monghyr, Bhagalpur and Purneā and the Terāi under Nepal lying between these districts and the lower ranges of the Himālaya[2]. It is a well-marked natural region with its size varying in different ages. From the foot-hills of the Himālaya in the north to the Gaṅgā in the south it is 100 miles broad and from the Mahānandā in the east to the Gaṇḍakī in the west it is 250 miles long. Its area is 25,000 square miles.

According to the Purāṇas it extended from the river Kauśikī in the east to Gaṇḍakī in the west, and from the Gaṅgā in the south to the forest of the Himālaya in the north. The forest on the banks of the Gaṇḍakī was known

1. Imp. Gaz. Ind., VIII, p. 187; Darb. Dist. Gaz., p. 152

2. Darb. Dist. Gaz., p. 152; Singh, History of Tirhut, pp. 2—3; Rapson, Ancient India, pp. 174—75.

as Campāraṇya. The Śakti-Saṅgama-Tantra[1] says that "from the banks of the Gaṇḍakī (*Gaṇḍakītīram ārabhya*) to the forest of Campā, the country is called Videha, also known as Tīrabhukti". This "Gaṇḍakī-tīra", according to D. C. Sircar, appears to indicate the southern boundary of the country. Campāraṇya (modern Champāran) seems to be the northern boundary. The name Tīrabhukti still survives in its modern form, Tirhut[2].

Mithilā has played a noteworthy part in the political and cultural life of ancient India. It has witnessed the rise

1. Gaekwad's Oriental Series (Ed B. Bhattacharyya), Vol. CIV. (Sundarīkhaṇḍa, Pt. III) p. 69. V. 42—

"गण्डकीतीरमारभ्य चम्पारण्यान्तकं शिवे ।
विदेहभूः समाख्याता तैरभुक्त्यभिधः स तु ॥"

In Jha Com. Vol. (p. 380) we have an interesting piece of information purporting to the grant made to the ancestors of the present Mahārājā of Darbhanga by Emperor Akbar. It describes Mithilā as follows—"from Kos to Gos and from the Gaṅgā to the Stone (Himālaya)." — 'अज़ कोष ता गास् व अज़ गङ्ग ता सङ्ग" Kos is evidently Kośī. Why Gaṇḍaka should be called Gos is, however, not clear. The original grant is written in Urdu script.' See also Grierson, Linguistic Survey of India, Vol.V, Pt.II, p. 13.

2. I. C. Vol. VIII, pp. 41, 54 : "कौशिकीन्तु समारभ्य गण्डकीमधिगम्य वै ";
Mithilāmāhātmya p. 14, Vs. 5-8 (Darb. Ed.). Ray Chaudhuri takes the kingdom of Videha corresponding to the modern Tirhut in North Bihar (PHAI[5], p.44.). Keith and Macdonell are of opinion that it was separated from Kosala by the river Sadānīrā, usually identified with the modern Gaṇḍaka which, rising in Nepal, flows into the Gaṅgā opposite Patna (VI, II, p. 299). Oldenberg points out the difference between Gaṇḍakī and Sadānīrā and Pargiter takes the Sadānīrā to be identical with the Rāpti It is one of the "five Indias" of Yuan Chwang (Watters II, 81 ; Tripāthi, History of Kanauj, p. 119.)

and fall of great monarchies and republics. In the history of human thought it has carved out a place of unique distinction. It has been the land of the Janakas, Yājñavalkya, Gautama (author of the *Nyāya Sūtras*), Kaṇāda (propounder of the *Vaiśeṣika system*), Jaiminī (founder of the *Mīmāṃsā*) and Kapila (founder of the *Sāṃkhya* philosophy). Vaiśālī, a town within her border, became the renowned stronghold of Jaina and Buddhist religions and philosophy. Again in the 6th century A. D. and onwards she witnessed great literary and philosophical activities. Uddyotakara (C. 700 A. D.), Maṇḍana (C. 800 A. D.), Vācaspati (C. 840 A.D), Udayana (C. 950 A.D.), Gaṅgeśa (C. 1100 A. D.), Pakṣadhara (C. 1450 A. D.) and several other scholars illumined the successive ages by their genius. For ages it has been the home of Indian culture.

THE NAME

The origin of the words 'Videha' and 'Mithilā,' as given in ancient literature, is purely mythical. According to Julius Eggeling this country was in those days the extreme land of the Āryans[1]. The country is said to have derived its name from King Videgha Māṭhava or Videha Mādhava who came from the banks of the Sarasvatī. A legend in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa[2] tells us that Agni Vaiśvānara went burning along the earth from the Sarasvatī towards the east, followed by Māṭhava and his priest Gotama Rahūgaṇa until he came to the river Sadānīrā (Gaṇḍakī) which flows from the northern (Himālaya) mountain. Brāhma-

1. SBE. XII, Intro. XLII–XLIII
2. I. 4. 1.

nas had not crossed it before, thinking, 'it has not been burnt over by Agni Vaiśvānara'. At that time the land to the east was marshy and uncultivated. After Māṭhava's arrival, however many Brāhmaṇas went there. It was now cultivated, for the Brāhmaṇas had caused Agni, the Fire-god, to taste it through sacrifices. Māṭhava, the Videgha, said to Agni, "Where am I to abide ?" "To the east of this (river) be thy abode", said he. Even now this forms the boundary of the Kosalas and the Videhas; for these are the Māthavas or descendants of Māthava[1]. The name of Mithi Vaideha, the second king in the epic and the Purāṇic lists, is reminiscent of Māṭhava Videgha.

Nimi, the son of Manu, King of Ayodhyā, came to this "land of sacrifices". His son Mithi founded a kingdom here which was named 'Mithilā' after himself. A 'city-builder', he came to be known as 'Janaka'[2]. We are also told that he was named Mithi because of his birth from attrition. He was also called 'Janaka" on account of his extraordinary birth, and "Videha" as his father was bodiless. The country thus named after him, was henceforward known as "Mithilā".

We have an interesting account of the origin of this land told in the Viṣṇu Purāṇa[3] closely followed by Śrīmad-

1. SBE. XII, pp. 104-05; To this important legend attention was first drawn by Prof. Weber, cf. Ind. Stud. I, 170; J. Muir, Sanskrit Texts II, p, 402

2. "निमि: पुत्रस्तु तत्रैव मिथिर्नाम महान् स्मृत:
प्रथमं भुजबलेर्येन त्रैहुतस्य पार्श्वत:
निर्म्मित स्वीयनाम्ना च मिथिलापुरमुत्तमम्"
पुरीजननसामर्थ्यात् जनक: स च कीर्तित: ।।

[Quoted from Bhaviṣya Purāṇa in Sabda Kalpadruma, pt. III, 723]

3. IV, 21-2; 5-1

Bhāgavata[1]. It is said that 'Nimi, the son of Ikṣvāku instituted a sacrifice that was to last for a thousand years and asked Vaśiṣṭha to preside. Vaśiṣṭha replied that he had already been engaged by Indra in a sacrifice which would last for 500 years and asked him to wait for that period. Nimi made no answer and Vaśiṣṭha thought that he had agreed, and went away Nimi in the meantime, employed Gautama and other *Riṣis* and started his sacrifice. Vaśiṣṭha came in all haste to Nimi but finding Gautama and others employed, cursed Nimi that he would henceforth cease to exist in corporal form. Nimi cursed Vaśiṣṭha in turn and both abandoned their human bodies". From the Bṛhadviṣṇu Purāṇa (Mithilāmāhātmyam[2]) we further learn that Gautama, Yājñavalkya, Bhṛgu, Vāmadeva, Uśita, Kaṇva, Agastya, Bhāradvāja, Vālmīki and other sages assembled at Gaṅgāsāgara[3] situated in Mithilā, and after bathing the

1. IX, 13, 'Nimivaṃśānuvarṇanam'.

2. Mithilāmāhātmya [Darb. Ed.], Adhyāya 6, Vs. 5-7, pp. 51-52 ("Gautamaṃ Yājñavalkyaṃ ca Yajñamantrairathākarotat. . Mithis tatra samutpanno mithilā tenasā'bhavat) ; Law, Some Kṣatriya Tribes,p. 135; JBRS, XXXVII, Pts. 3-4, p. 82; Singh, P. 2, fn 2.

Also cf. Rām 1.70; The Mahāgovinda Suttanta of the Dīghanikāya, however, gives another account of its origin and states that Mithilā of the Videhas was built by Govinda (PTS II. p, 235; Law, Kṣatriya Tribes, 136). We do not know who this Govinda was, and it is very difficult to form any opinion on such a legendary account.

3. This Gaṅgāsāgara (the place where the Gaṅgā falls into the sea) was different from the present Gaṅgāsāgara near the Diamond Harbour, Calcutta. In ancient times the sea extended upto the Himālaya. On account of constant siltation, Gaṅgāsāgara has been shifting south eastwar. The Gaṅgāsāgara referred to here might be somewhere near Mithilā, in her south-east, at Munger or Bhagalpur or Rajmahal.

dead body with its sacred water, attrited it. Out of it was produced a resplendent body who was named Mithi.

Pāṇini,[1] however, derives Mithilā somewhat differently. He writes—"*Mithilādayaśca*" *mathyante'tra ripavo mithilā-nagari* i. e., "Mithilā is the country where enemies are crushed". This derivation seems convincing. Firstly, because the Maithilās were brave fighters as is evidenced by the Rāmāyaṇa which narrates Sīradhvaja Janaka's conquest of the king of Sankāśya[2], and the Maithilas' participation in the Great Bhārata battle against the Pāṇḍavas[3]. Their supremacy in spiritual and cultural sphere also entitled them to this distinction. Secondly, Nimi was the son of Ikṣvāku, the founder of the Solar line of the kings of Ayodhyā. While one of his brothers established himself in Viśālā and founded the kingdom of Vaiśālī, another went to Mithilā, making his capital city as great as Ayodhyā. Like the great Bhārata tribe, after whom the entire Āryāvarta was named, the Maithilas too, a brave people, named the land of their glories and achievements after themselves[4].

1. Uṇādi. 60. In the Sabda-kalpa-druma (Pt. III, p. 723) we have the following derivation—

'मथ्यन्ते शत्रवो यस्यां । मथ+'मिथिलादयश्च' । इति इलच अकारस्यत्वं निपात्यते स्वनामख्यात नगरी । स तु जनकराजपुरी यथा । विदेहा मिथिलाप्रोक्ता । इति हलायुधः ।
Thus the author of this book gives us exactly the same derivation as does Pāṇini,

2. Rām, i, 70, 2-3; 71, 16 - 20

कस्यचित्त्वथ कालस्य सांकाश्यादागतः पुरात्
सुधन्वा वीर्यवान्राजा मिथिलामवरोधकः ॥
निहत्य तं मुनिश्रेष्ठ सुधन्वानं नराधिपम्
साकाश्ये भ्रातरं शूरमभ्यसिचत्कुशध्वजम्"—Vs;16-19,

Also cf, AIHT. p, 275; CAI, p. 138

3. AIHT, p, 273; CAIp, 248

4. Macdonell & Keith, VI, II, pp, 46, 298; SBE. XII. pp,104-05;

Besides Mithilā, it has various other names too, such as Videha, Tīrabhukti, Tapobhūmi, Śāmbhavī, Suvarṇakānana, Mantili, Vaijayantī (Janakapura) etc.[1] But of all these names Mithilā, Videha and Tīrabhukti are well known to the tradition and to the history as well. The name 'Videha' we come across first of all in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa[2].

Tīrabhukti or Tirhut is a later term. The name Mithilā' is older than Tīrabhukti or Tirhut. We do not find Tīrabhukti in the Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmīki or other ancient literature. It is in the Trikāṇḍa Śeṣa that we meet with this name as "*Prāgjyotiṣaḥ Kāmarūpe Tīrabhuktis tu Nicchaviḥ*[3]. It has been described as a place situated along the bank of three big rivers—Gaṅgā, Gaṇḍakī, and Kauśiki[4]. It thus seems that Tīrabhukti is evidently derived

1. Trived, History of Pre-Mauryan Bihar, pp, 82 ff : He has mentioned as many as twelve names. The oldest name which we find about Mithilā in Prākṛta literature is 'Mihila' (JIH, XXVII. Pt, III, p, 295)

2. "जनको ह वैदेहो"—xi, 6, 2, 5; xi, 4, 4, 13; xiv, 6, 12, 2 ; Taitt. Brā. 3, 10, 9, 9,

3. Trikāṇḍa Śeṣa, p, 59. Puruṣottama Deva was the author of this book. He was born in the family of Halāyudha in the middle of the 12th cent. A. D:

There is a chapter on Mithilā called Mithilātīrthakalpa in the Jaina Vividhatīrthakalpa or Kalpapradīpa by Sri Jina Prabha Sūri of the 14th cent. V. S., which records the present name of the country as Tirahutti (JIH. XXVII. Pt. III, p. 296

4. Jhā, Mithilā-bhāṣāmaya-Itihāsa (Maithilī) p 3; In Encyclopaedia Britannica (XV. 241), it is stated that "Tirhut is a corruption of Tīrabhurti (i. e. Tīrabhukti) meaning the river-side country". Wilson, Sansk-Eng-Dict, 367; Sabda-kalpa-druma II, 625. The author of the Mithilā-Darpaṇa (Das, pp 7-8, 1915 Ed.) offers as many as ten different suggestions as to the origin of Tirhut but they read more like legendary tales than sober historical interpretation.

from *tīra* and *bhukti*. Haraprasad Śāstrī rightly considered it to mean the province bordering on the Gaṅgā, and that the word *bhukti* was used in the sense of a province during the eleventh or twelfth century A. D. . According to General Cunningham, the term referred to the lands lying in the valleys of the little Gaṇḍaka and Bāgamatī rivers. All the chief places in the country are found situated on the banks of the former river which must have been the channel of the great Gaṇḍaka river in the 7th century A. D.[1]

Haraprasad Śāstrī is of opinion that the word *bhukti* is not very ancient as it is used in the Sena inscriptions for a province during 12th century A. D. According to him the term was first used when the Sena kings of Bengal conquered the country and settled a number of Bengali Bráhmaṇas in it[2]. But, as we know, *bhogapati* is the very common name for the governor of a province, and *bhukti* evidently is a much older expression for a province

According to a tradition it means the land in which three great sacrificial homas were performed; one at the birth of Sītā in or near Sitamarhi (now in the Muzaffarpur district : for different views on Sītā's birth-place cf. JIH. XXIX, Pt. III pp 307-10), the second at Dhanukhā at the foot of the Himālayā when the great celestial bow of Hara (Siva) was broken by Rāma and the third in Janakapura (now in Nepal) on the occasion of the marriage of Sītā. (Jhā com. Vol., pp. 250-51) The signification can be squeezed out by making it Tribhukti. Even then we shall have to attach an extraordinary signification to 'bhukti'. Some modern writers explain Tirhut as a corruption of Tributam i. e. the country of three sacrifices (Singh, p. 4)

1 Reports, Arch. Surv. Ind. Vol XVI

2 Darb. Distt. Gaz. p 157

than 'Sena kings of Bengal'. The name *Tīrabhukti*, appears, however, to be far more ancient, for in the excavations carried out at Basārh (Vaiśāli in Muzaffarpur district) of 1903–04[1], numerous seals dating back to the fourth century A. D. (of the Gupta period) were discovered, on which the name occurs. Some of these seals were attached to letters addressed to officers who were in charge of Tīrabhukti. Besides this word, there is the simple *tīra*, which, it is suggested, was the locality from which the name Tīrabhukti or Province of Tīra was derived ("*Tīrabhuktau Vaiśālī-tārā*"—"The Tārā of Vaiśālī in Tirhut"). On the basis of these evidences we can safely conclude that the term is a very ancient one.

Mithilā or Tirhut comprised in ancient times the kingdom of Vaiśāli which had become part of the Videhan Kingdom, under Janaka Ugrasena, and at least three other Janakas after him[2]. According to Cunningham the Videhan Kingdom extended from the district of Darbhanga to that of Munger. According to Yuan Chwang "the boundaries of Vaiśalī are the great Gaṇḍaka to the west, little Gaṇḍaka to the east and the Gaṅga to the south.[3] Little Gaṇḍaka, also known as Būḍhī Gaṇḍaka, rises in the Campāran district in the Sumirāon range, flows southward, then south-east and enters

1 Arch. Surv. Ind. Ann. Rep. 1903-04 p 81 ff; Vāmana in his Liṅgānuśāsana has mentioned Tīrabhukti ("वरेन्द्राः तीरभुक्तिर्मि देशः") and as Vāmana lived in the 8th cent. A.D., it is clear that the name Tīrabhukti or Tirhut was known also in the 8th cent. A.D.(Gaekwad's Oriental Series, No VI. p. 18)

2 S. C. Sarkar in Homage to Vaiśāli (compiled) p. 65

3 Watters, II. pp. 63-80

Muzaffarpur district at Ghosewat. It then flows eastward towards Muzaffarpur which stands on its southern bank. It flows parallel to the Bāgamatī and passes into Darbhanga near Pusa, 20 miles S. E. of Muzaffarpur. It falls into the Gaṅgā opposite Munger. The Kingdom of Vaiśālī, therefore, evidently covered a part of the districts of Campāran, Muzaffarpur and Darbhanga. Little Gaṇḍaka frequently changes its course. Its old beds which the stream has deserted, are still traceable. The inscription *Tīrabhuktau Vaiśalī Tārā* discovered in the Basārh Excavations (1903–04), also found on the inscribed miniature paintings of two palm-leaf manuscripts of the 12th century A. D., is a direct proof as, even as late as the 12th century A.D., Vaiśalī was known to have been in Tirhut. The ancient Videhan Kingdom thus comprised the present districts of Camparan, Muzaffarpur, Darbhanga, Munger (north), Bhagalpur (north), Purneā and the terāi lying between these districts and the lower ranges of the Himālaya.

SOURCES

No Megasthenes or Fa-hian has left for us an account of ancient Mithilā. No literature, geographical or historical, affords us any glimpse into the history of that land. Incidental references are, however, found in works of non-geographical and non-historical character which help us in building up an intelligible story. These accounts are sometimes supplemented by foreign notices. Archaeological sources—except a few inscriptions of Nānyadeva and his successors and so-called gold coins of Śiva Siṃha of Medieval Mithilā—which have been mainly responsible for illumining many "dark periods" in ancient Indian history—

also fail us here. No inscription or coin has been discovered so far which can be referred with fair amount of certainty to the history of ancient Mithilā. The accounts of foreign travellers—Chinese, Muslims and others—do not much enlighten our path. Moreover, the various sources including tradition, legends, myths, philosophical and scientific treatises and *belle lettres* quite often conflict with each other and make it difficult for the historian to arrive at a conclusion.

The various sources may be divided into classes. They are almost the same as provide the basis of the history of ancient India as a whole. The Vedas except the last book of Atharvaveda, make no direct contribution. It is the Brāhmaṇas that give us the largest amount of information about the early dynasties. These are the Śatapatha including the Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad, Taittirīya, Aitareya and Pañcaviṃśa as well as the Chāndogya and other principal Upaniṣads.

The works belonging to the "post-Parikṣita period" give us a glimpse of the life at the court of the Janaka of Videha, "where the fate of the Parīkṣitas was made the subject of philosophical discussion"[1]. The Brāhmaṇas present the intellectual activity of a sacerdotal caste which by turning to account the religious instincts of a gifted and naturally devout race, had succeeded in transforming a primitive worship of the powers of nature into a highly arti-

1 PHAI[6], p. 3; we have the following query asked in the Bṛh. up. (III. 3. 1. ; E. Roer, Bṛh. up. p. 20)—"क्व पारिक्षिता अभवन्—whither have the Parikṣitas gone ?" To this Yājñavalkya answered—"Thither where the performers of the horse-sacrifice abide." (Weber, Ind. Lit. 126 ff; PHAI[6] . p. 49 fn. 2).

ficial system of sacrificial ceremonies[1]. There are passages in the Brāhmaṇas full of genuine thoughts and feelings, valuable as pictures of life, as record of early struggles which have left no trace in the literature of other nations[2]. In the whole of Brāhmaṇic literature, the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, in its compass, undoubtedly occupies the most significant position. What throws special light upon the date of the eleventh *Kāṇḍa* is the frequent mention here made, and for the first time, of Janaka, King (*Samrāṭ*) of Videha as the patron of Yājñavalkya. The legends interspersed in large number throughout the Brāhmaṇa—for instance, the legend of the Deluge and the rescue of Manu, of the emigration of Videgha Māthava from the Sarasvatī to the Sadānīrā in the country of the Kosala-Videhas—are of great interest[3].

The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa gives us information about the condition of the country towards the end of the Brāhmaṇa period.

The Upaniṣads, particularly the Chāndogya and the Bṛhadāraṇyaka, are of unique importance. They are put forth in such convincing form and language that it may well be said that they are the most precious possessions of posterity, surpassing as they do even the dialogues of Plato in eloquence and subtlety of thought. Their language is both simple and eloquent, and their style, though still that of the Brāhmaṇas, is yet without their tedius repititions or puerile quibbles[4]. We have from them an interesting

1. SBE. Vol. XII, Intro.

2. Max Müller, Hist. Anc. Lit., p. 408; Vaidya, Hist. Skt. Lit. I, p. 16.

3. Ibid, I. 17-18, 35; The Vedic Age pp. 310—11; Weber, Hist. Ind. Lit., pp. 116—23, 134.

4. Vaidya. op. clit. p. 175.

account of social and political condition of the country in the Upaniṣadic Age, i.e., between 2500 B. C. and 2000 B. C., coupled with that of Āryan expansion from Gandhāra on the west of the Indus to Videha beyond the Sadānīrā and the flourishing of several contemporary kingdoms or peoples such as Madra and Kekaya, Kuru and Pañcāla, Kosala and Videha, Kauśāmbī and Kāśī.

To the second class of materials belong the Brāhmaṇical works of the later period. e. g., Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra, Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya etc. But these sources do not carry us far for the history of ancient Mithilā.

The third class of materials comprise the Buddhist and Jaina works. They "vouchsafe light when the light from the Brāhmaṇical sources begins to fail"[1]. The records of the Buddhists and Jainas about the philosophical ideas current at the time of Buddha and Mahāvīra (c. 600 B. C.) are of importance to the historian of that epoc. For, they show us the ground on which and the materials with which a religious reformer had to build his system. The Mahāpaṇāda Jātaka, Gandhāra Jātaka, Suruci Jātaka., Mahājanaka Jātaka., Nimi Jātaka., Mahānāradakassapa Jātaka., etc. supply us with valuable material for a picture of the political and cultural life of the times. They reflect the every day life of the common man--his feelings and thoughts, his struggles, his art and craftsmanship, trade and commerce. The Jātaka literature thus portrays his every walk of life--from bread to politics.

The Jaina scriptures too, in this respect, are no less important. They abound in elaborate and flowery descri-

1. PHAI[6], p. 11.

ptions of towns, temples, gardens and prominent persons[1]. The Uttarādhyāyana Sūtra, Uvāsagadasāo, Kalpasūtra. Sthavirāvalī Carita (Pariśiṣṭaparvan) offer us valuable materials for our period. Sometimes the legends of the Buddhist and Jaina texts surprisingly coincide–for example, the story of King Nami belongs to a vast cycle of legends concerning the four '*pratyekabuddhas*'–four kingly saints–very famous amongst the Jainas and Buddhists and to some degree known to the Brāhmaṇa. In the verses it contains certain striking cases of coincidence with stanzas occurring in the old Buddhist poetry of the Jātakas.

To the fourth class of materials belong the Mahābhārata the Rāmāyaṇa and the Purāṇas. The epics provide us with important material for the history of our period. The Ādikāṇḍa of the Rāmāyaṇa gives us a dynastic list of the family of Sīradhvaja Janaka, father of Sītā[2]. It also tells us about the political condition of the different contemporary states.

The Purāṇic sources, though of a divergent character, are numerous. They sometimes conflict with one another, sometimes the same Purāṇa makes–though rarely–different statements in different places; sometimes collateral successions are described as lineal; sometimes the orders of succession are reversed; dynastic periods are lengthened by various corrupt readings; and divergent synchronisms have been recorded[3]. Some scholars. however, give more weight to Purānic tradition[4]. Ray Chaudhuri takes the epics and

1- SBE. XLV., p. 35 ff.
2. Rām. 1. 71.
3. CAI. (Pref. p. xi.)
4. AIHT. p. 9 ff: CR. 1924, p. 249.

the Purāṇas "in their present shape" to be late works "which are no better suited t serve as the foundation of the history of the Pre-Bimbisarian age than are the tales of Mahavāṃśa and Aśokāvadāna".[1] But the historical value of epics and Purāṇas cannot be dismissed as wholly unworthy of credence. Seven out of the eighteen Purāṇas still retain the fifth section which contains an account of kings who had ruled during the historical period. As far as their subject-matter is concerned, the epics and the Purāṇas are the literary descendants of the stories and legends (*Itihāsas* and *Purāṇas*) which are mentioned in literature from the time of the Atharvaveda onwards. No serious students of Indian history, therefore, can ever ignore those legendary elements. It is true, we cannot accept those traditions as historical facts so long as they are not corroborated by contemporary texts or other trustworthy evidences. We can treat them, however, as 'traditional history' which has its own value[2].

We have a few accounts of foreign travellers—Fa-hian, Yuan Chwang, Song Yun, Itsing and others including the the Muslim travellers. But, Yuan Chwang is the only foreign traveller to whom we are indebted for the detailed information about the later Licchavis (Vaijis) the Tīrabhuktis and the Videhas. The Muslim historians—Ferishta, Al Badaoni, Abul Fazl, M. Abdus Salim, Gulam Husain Khan and others—give us some information by way of references and illustrations about Medieval Mithilā under the onslaughts of the Muslim invaders.

1. PHAI[6]. p.6
2. The Vedic Age, p. 311.

We have also Gilgit MSS. in three volumes edited by Dr. Nalinākṣha Dutta. These, though of a later poriod, depict the political history of ancient Mithilā. From them we learn that even when Vaiśālī had a republican form of government, there was monarchy existing in Mithilā or Videha. As regards Vaiśālī and its descriptions, the Licchavis, their constitution and strange manners and customs we have some new information in these MSS., not found elsewhere. They present us with a vivid contrast between the republican and monarchical forms of government, the former called *Janādhīna* and the latter *Ekādhīna*[1]. The general political history of North Eastern India as envisaged in these texts is also not without interest. The mention of Videha as a kingdom is important as the king of Videha is said to have five hundred *Amātyas* with Khaṇḍa as Chief or *Agrāmātya*[2].

We have also some medieval Sanskrit literature, written mostly by local scholars during the period. Several MSS. are kept safe in the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal. They are as follows—(i) Bhaṭṭikāvya-ṭīkā by Śrīnivāsa[3]; (ii) Kṛtyakalpataru (Śuddhi) by Lakṣmīdhara[4]; (iii)

1. B. C. Law Vol. Pt. I. p. 146.
2. Ibid, pp. 140-41.
3. No. G 4795.
4. No. G 4741, and also No. G. 4026; Kṛtya-Kalpataru of Lakṣmidhara Bhaṭṭa, minister of king Govinda Chandra of Kanauj, is one of the earliest Law-digests. It consists of 14 Kāṇḍas or sections of which the following have now been published in Gaekwad's Oriental Series, Baroda (Edited by K. V. Rangaswami Aiyangar) in 12 Volumes—(i) Brahmacārī Kāṇḍa, (ii) Gṛhastha Kāṇḍa, (iii) Niyatakāla Kāṇḍa, (iv) Srāddha Kāṇḍa, (v) Dāna Kāṇḍa, (vi) Tīrtha-vivecana Kāṇḍa, (vii) Suddhi Kāṇḍa, (viii) Rājadharma-Kāṇḍa, (ix) Vyavahāra-Kāṇḍa, (x) Mokṣa Kāṇḍa.

Liṅgavārtika by Jayasiṃha[1]; (iv) Kāvyaprakāśa-viveka by Śrīdhara Thakkura[2] and (v) Chāndogapariśiṣṭa by Nārāyaṇa[3]. These MSS. help us to determine the chronology of some of the Medieval Maithila kings whose dates so far have been controversial. Vidyāpati's Puruṣa-Parīkṣā (written in Sanskrit) and Kīrttilatā (in *avahattha*, i.e. *Maithila apabhraṃśa*) throw refreshing light upon a period of about 100 years of the medieval Maithila history. Then, there are some modern works in Maithilī by local scholars which attempt at a none-too-systematic history of the land. They are mostly of little value to a historian of the period.

The Nepalese Durbar MSS., or the Vaṃśāvalīs, discovered by Cecil Bendall and Haraprasada Śāstrī; the MSS. collected by Rājendralāl, Eggeling and Keith, and also the Descriptive Catalogue of Manuscripts in Mithilā, compiled and edited by Kasiprasad Jayaswal and Anantaprasad Śāstrī, render us but little help, for the lists of names and dates of the kings, supplied by them, are full of confusion. When corroborated by evidences culled from the inscriptions of Mānadeva, Jiṣṇugupta, Jayadeva, Śivadeva and other Nepalese Kings[4] and those of Nānyadeva[5], Śivasiṃha[6] and a few coins they help us to remove some confusions.

The Pañjī or Chronicle (locally known as Pañjīprabandha) of the kings of Mithilā is an important

1. No. G. 4831.
2. No. G. 4738.
3. No. G. 1298.
4. IA. Vols. IX, XIII & XIV.
5. JBORS. IX. 303.
6. IA. XIV, 190.

document. It begins in Śaka 1235 (1313 A. D.) in the reign of Harisiṃhadeva. (c. 1303--1326 A. D.). Along with genealogy it also enlightens us on social and religious customs of the land.[1]

We have thus literature enormous in extent and most varied in character. But in none of them has the art of historical composion been developed beyond primitive stages. From the literature and from the monuments we learn the names and some of the achievements of a country which rose to power, flourished and declined in the sub-continent of India before the Mohammedan conquests.

1. According to some scholars the Pañjis (Geneologies) were collected and consolidated in the Saka year 1248 or 1326 A. D. (Vide — Memorandum, All India Maithila Mahāsabhā, 1954, p. 7). This date does not seem to be correct. We know that Harisiṃhadeva, the last Karṇāṭa king of Mithilā was defeated by Ghiāsuddin Tughlaq in 1324 A.D., and the Pañjis were collected before this period. The volume of the work is in itself a direct proof that it took a few years to complete. The date, Saka 1235 or 1313 A. D. seems, therefore, more convincing.

The following verse gives Saka 1232 or 1310 A. D. as the date of the preparation of the Pañjīs;

"शाके श्रीहरिसिंहदेवनृपतिर्भूयार्कतुल्योजनि:
तस्माद्दत मितेऽब्दके द्विजगण: पञ्जीप्रबन्ध: कृत:"

CHAPTER II

THE EARLY MONARCHY

THE VIDEHAS

(Circa 3000 B. C.—Circa 600 B.C.)

The name Videha was given to the people and to the country. There lived to the east of the *Madhyadeśa* at the time of the redaction of the Brāhmaṇas a confederacy of kindred peoples known as the Kośala-Videhas occupying a position of no less importance than that of the Kuru-Pañcālas [1]. The Videhan country was in those days the extreme east of the land of the Āryans [2].

Manu says, however, that "the offspring of a Vaiśya father and Brāhmaṇa mother is a Vaideha, a native of Videha, i.e., northern Bihar. They live by guarding the harems of kings. The duties assigned to them are the charge of bolts and bars for protecting the privacy of women of respectable house-holders"[3]. The Videhas, it seems,

1. Law, Kṣatriya Tribes. p. 126.
2. SBE. XII, Intro. XLII--XLIII.
3. Manu X, II.

"क्षत्रियाद्विप्रकन्यायां सूतो भवति जातित:
वैश्यान्मागधवैदेहौ राजविप्राङ्गनासुतौ" –[X. II]

Again—"सूतो वैदेहकश्चैव चण्डालश्च नराधम:
मागध: क्षत्रजातिश्च तथाऽऽयोगव एव च" [X. 26]

Also cf, X, 17, 19, 33, 47; Barnett, Antiquities of India. p. I33. Gautama, IV. 17.

were not held in high esteem because of the chastening of the caste rules caused by the spread of Jainism and Buddhism. Manusmṛti speaks of the land of the "Brahmarṣis" *(Brahmarṣi-deśaḥ)*[1] the home of the upright and holy Bharatas. The Kuru-Pañcālas stand out among the peoples of Āryāvarta as the leaders of political and cultural advancement[2].

The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa enumerates the different peoples that inhabited northern India in the later Vedic age.[3] In the middle lay the realms of the Kuru-Pañcālas together with Vaśas and Uśīnaras. To the south of this land of the middle there dwelt the Sātvatas, eastward the Prācyas (the Kāśī, Kosala, Videha and Magadha peoples). The land of the Brahmarṣis whose way of life was taken as the model, whose warriors were the bravest, undoubtedly comprised Kurukṣetra and the territories of the Matsyas, the Pañcālas and the Śūrasenas. This was the land referred to in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa as Madhyamā diś[4]. But what is regarded in the Aitareya as the East, the land beyond the eastern peoples of Kāśī, Kosala, Videha and Magadha—is

1. Manu, II, 17-22.
2. Oldenberg, Buddha, pp. 9-10.
3. VIII 3. 14—"एतस्यां प्राच्यां दिशि ये के च प्राच्यानां राजानः साम्राज्यायैव तेऽभिषिच्यन्ते सम्राड्डित्येतानभिषिक्तानाचक्षत"; Also cf. Pañcaviṃśa Brā. XIV. 1. 12; Sat. Brā. V. 1. 1, 12-13; Rigveda Brāhmaṇas, translated by Keith, Harvard Oriental Series, Vol, 25, pp. 330-31.
4, Ait. Brā, VIII. 3. 14—"एतस्यां ध्रुवायां मध्यमायां प्रतिष्ठायां दिशि ये के च कुरु-पंचालानां राजानः सवश-औशीनराणां राज्यायैव तेऽभिषिच्यन्ते राजेत्येनानभिषिक्ता-नाचक्षत"; Also cf. Oldenberg, Buddha, p. 394 fn.

in Manu excluded from the *land of the Brahmarṣis*[1]. This, however, makes a clear distinction between those who claimed to be the sole champions of the Āryan culture and those Āryans of the east who were not regarded as such by the former [2].

The classification of the Videhas (and the Licchavis) as *Vrātyas* (the impure castes) is "a sign that this book (The Law Book of Manu or Manu's Institutes) is long posterior to the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa where the Vaidehas appear as the leading representatives of Brahmanism". The position allotted to this tribe may perhaps further be connected with the fact that "the Videhas (and especially the Licchavi family of them) exercised material influence on the growth of Buddhism". It is significant that Jainism and Buddhism originated and grew in the region where Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa was composed[3].

1, Manu, II, 17-21 :

"सरस्वतीदृषद्वत्योर्देवनद्योर्यदन्तरम्
तं देवनिर्मितं देशं ब्रह्मावर्तं प्रचक्षते ॥
तस्मिन्देशे य आचारः पारंपर्यक्रमागतः
वर्णानां सान्तरालानां स सदाचार उच्यते ॥
कुरुक्षेत्रं च मत्स्याश्च पञ्चालाः शूरसेनकाः ।
एष ब्रह्मर्षिदेशो वै ब्रह्मावर्तादनन्तरः ॥
एतद्देशप्रसूतस्य सकाशादग्रजन्मनः
स्वं स्वं चरित्रं शिक्षेरन्पृथिव्यां सर्वमानवाः ॥
हिमवद्विन्ध्ययोर्मध्यं यत्प्राग्विनशनादपि
प्रत्यगेव प्रयागाच्च मध्यदेशः प्रकीर्तितः ॥

2. Dr. Suniti Kumar Chatterji holds that the Videhas and the Licchavis were Indo-Mangoloids (Vide---Kirāta-Jana-Kṛti in JRASB, Vol, XVI, 1950, No. 2, pp. 169, 179). It is evident that Dr. Chatterji has based his assumption on the statements of Manu and other scholars who advocate the Vrātya origin of the Videhas and the Licchavis,

3. Weber, Hist. Ind. Lit., pp. 276-77; 284-85.

The legend of Videgha Māṭhava and his Purohita Gotama Rāhūgaṇa is, according to some scholars, an evidence of the east-ward spread of Āryan civilisation[1]. In the period of the Rigveda, the centre of civilisation was shifting from the west, the land of the five rivers, to the east, the land between the Sarasvatī and Dṛṣadvatī, the home of the Bharatas. It seems that in the Brāhmaṇa period the regions east of the Kuru-Pañcāla country came into prominence, especially Kāśī, Kosala and Videha[2].

It is not true to say that the Videhas and the Kosalas did not exist during the Rigvedic times[3]. That the Rigvedic sage Nami Sāpya[4]. (Nimi or Nemi of the Purāṇa[5]), the killer of Dāsa Chief Namuci, was the king of Videha shows that Videha was already an Āryan settlement during the Rigvedic period[6]. Gotama Rāhugaṇa, the priest of Māthava Videgha was also a Rigvedic Riṣi, and composer of several *sūktas* of the Rigveda[7]. He was a contemporary of Rājana Kauṇeya, Ugradeva Rājani, Kratujit Jānaki, Keśin, Khāṇḍika and Khāṇḍika Audbhāri who are mentioned in the Saṃhitās, Brāhmaṇas and Śrauta Sūtras[8]. In fact this eastward extension of Āryan culture was achieved in the

1. SBE. XII, p. 10ff.
2. CHI. Vol. I., pp. 116-17; D. R. Bhandarkar Volume—Law, p. 2; Vaidya, Hist. Skt. Lit. Vol. I. p 16; The Vedic Age, pp. 227-37.
3. Das, Rgvedic Culture, p. 88ff
4. Rv. I, 53. 7; vi, 20. 6; VI. I. p. 436; Pañca, Brā. XXV. 10. 16--18 (story of Nami Sāpya.)
5. Vāyu. 88. 7-8; 89. 3-4; Viṣṇu. IV. 5. 1.
6. CAI. p. 308.
7. X. 12. 38.
8. CAI. p. 308.

time of the Rigveda itself. It is because of this early expansion that we find Videha leading in Vedic culture under king Janaka and Ṛṣi Yājñavalkya[1].

The Videhas were a great ancient people with a distinct culture. It is also possible that Videgha Māṭhava gave the name of Videha to this tract of land after occupying it as most of the conquerors in history have done. A Rigvedic people with a great civilisation, they soon shot up into prominence and dominated the cultural scene of North-Eastern India for a long time.

The kingdom of Videha seems to be mentioned for the first time in the Saṃhitās of the Yajurveda[2]. Mithilā, the capital of Videha, is not referred to in the Vedic texts, but is often mentioned in the Buddhist Jātakas and the Jaina and the Brāhmaṇa Purāṇas as well as the Epics. From the Bṛhadviṣṇu Purāṇa[3] we learn that Videha or Mithilā was

1. Dr. B. C. Law also observes: "In other works of the Brāhmaṇa period as well as of the Sūtra period that followed, other celebrated kings of Videha are mentioned, so that there can be no question but that the Videhas maintained a high position in Vedic society at least in the Brāhmaṇa period, and from the superior intellectual position that they had attained in this period it is legitimate to assume that Vedic Aryan culture had taken its root in Videha long before the Brāhmaṇa age, and most probably in the early Saṃhitā age of the Ṛgveda." (Vide-Tribes in Ancient India. Bhandarkar Oriental Series. 1943, pp. 236-37).

2. VI . II. 298; Keith, Veda of the Black Yajus' School, Vol. I. p. 138; JASB. 1897, pp. 87-89.

3. Mithilāmāhātmya (of the Bṛhadviṣṇu Pūrāṇa, Darb. Ed.); p. 16;

"कौशिकीं तु समारभ्य गण्डकीमधिगम्य च
योजनानि चतुर्विशत् व्यायाम: परिकीर्तित:
गंगाप्रवाहमारभ्य यावद्धैमवतं वनं
विस्तार: षोडश प्रोक्तो देशस्य कुलनन्दन (Chap II. Vs. 12-13)
गंगाहिमवतोर्मध्ये नदीपंचदशान्तरे
तैरभुक्तिरिति ख्यातो देश: परमपावन: (Chap. II. V.5.)

Also cf. Law, Some Kṣatriya Tribes, p. 137.

24 yojanas or 96 kosas in length from the river Kauśikī to the river Gaṇḍakī, and 16 yojanas or 64 kosas in breadth from the Gaṅgā to the Himālaya. Mīthilā, the capital was situated about thirtyfive miles from Vaiśālī. From the Suruci Jātaka[1] we know that the city of Mithilā covered seven leagues and the measure of the whole kingdom of Videha was three hundred leagues. According to Gandhāra Jātaka[2] "the city of Mithilā was seven leagues in extent, and the kingdom of Videha three hundred leagues in extent, with sixteen thousand villages, store-houses filled, and sixteen thousand dancing girls, and treasuries with wealth in plenty."

The Mahājanaka Jātaka[3] also gives a similar description. It describes the architectural brilliance of the "walls and gates and battlements, traversed by streets on every side" of Mithilā; its "horses, cows and chariots thronged with tanks and gardens beautified;" its "far-famed capital with its knights and warriors clad in their robes of tiger skins, with banners spread and flashing arms;" its "Brāhmins dressed in Kāsī cloth, perfumed with sandals, decked with gems" and "its palaces and all their queens with robes of state and diadems." The Mahānāradakassapa Jātaka[4] presents a picture of the pomp and splendour of the Videhan king whose "counsellors shone like the moon" and who possessed "many carriages, wealth and an innumerable army." The Mahāummagga Jātaka[5] describes the four gates

1. No. 489, Cowell, Vol. IV, 198.
2. No. 406, Cowell, Vol. III. pp. 222-23.
3. No. 539, Cowell, Vol, VI. pp. 46-47.
4. No: 544, Cowell, Vol. VI. p. 144.
5. No. 546, Fausboll, Vol. VI. p. 156 :—'मिथिलं पन चतूसु द्वारेसु प्राचीनयवमज्झको, दक्खिनयवमज्झको, पच्छिमयवमज्झको, उत्तरयवमज्झको ति चत्तारो निग्गमा'

of Mithilā and her four market-towns called the East town, the West-town, the South-town and the North-town. The Uvāsagadasāo frequently refers to the "great Videha country"[1].

We have further references to the court of Sīradhvaja Janaka which extended from the Hariharālaya (still extant in Janakapura) in the east to the temple of Jaleśvara Mahādeva (Janakapura) in the west. To the left of the Janaka-bhavana (Janaka's palace) was the palace of Kuśadhvaja, the brother of Sīradhvaja Janaka. Adjoining it were the stables, the treasury, the dancing-hall, the Durbar-hall, and many other splendid buildings. The land was full of hills, forests, tapovanas (meditation-places), flower-gardens, tanks & etc[2].

In the Mahābhārata[3] we have an interesting descript-

1. Ed. Hoernle, Vol. II, pp 4-9. Also cf. Law, Mahāvīra, His life and Teachings, p. 53 ff; Mahāvaṃśa, PTS, Chap. II, p. 12.

2. Das, Mithilā Darpaṇa, pp. 8-22; Mithilāmihira (Mithilāṅka). 1936, pp. 133-34.

3. Mbh. XII. 325, 17-22:

"पत्तनानि च रम्याणि स्फीतानि नगराणि च
रत्नानि च विचित्राणि शुकः पश्यन्नपश्यति
उद्यानानि च रम्याणि तथैवायतनानि च
पुण्यानि चैव रत्नानि सोऽत्यक्रामदथाध्वगः
सोऽचिरेणैव कालेन विदेहानाससाद ह
रक्षितान्धर्मराजेन जनकेन महात्मना
तत्र ग्रामान्बहून्पश्यन्बह्वन्नरसभोजनान्
पल्लीघोषान्समृद्धांश्च बहुगोकुलसंकुलान् (Vs. 17-20)
स विदेहानतिक्रम्य समृद्धजनसेवितान्
मिथिलोपवनं रम्यमाससाद समृद्धिमत् (V.22)

For a detailed description, cf. XII. 325, 1-45; (Mbh; critical Edition Poona, XII, 312); II. 20, 30, 132, 134; XII. 327; III. 134, 5—"सर्वे राज्ञो मैथिलस्य मैनाकस्येव पर्वताः । निकृष्टभूता राजानो वत्सा ह्यनडुहोयथा" ("As all other mountains are inferior to Mainaka, as all calves are to the bull, so are kings inferior to the Lord of Mithilā").

ion of Mithilā. Śukadeva goes to Mithilā to learn *brahma-vidyā* from Janaka, and is amazed at the splendour of the city.

In Si-yu-ki, Yuan Chwang calls the capital of the Vrijji country (Fo-li-shi) *Chen-Shu-na*. M. Julien restores this name to *Chañ-Sung*. V. de St. Martin connects the name with Janaka and Janakapura, the capital of Mithilā[1]. "This country of the Vrijji", the pilgrim further adds, "was long from east to west, and narrow from north to south"[2]. Cunningham, however, believes that ' this description corresponds exactly with the tract of country lying between the Gaṇḍaka and Mahānadī (evidently a mistake for Mahānandā) rivers, which is 300 miles in length by 100 miles in breadth. Within these limits there are several ancient cities, some of which may possibly have been the capitals of the eight different clans (of the Vajjis or Vrijjis). Besides Vaisālī, Kesariā and Janakapura, the others are Navandagarh (Nandanagarh), Simrūn (Simrāon), Darbangā (Darbhanga), Purainiya (Purnea) and Motihari (Champaran) The last three are still inhabited and are well known, but Simrūn has been deserted for upwards of 550 years, while Navandagarh has probably been abandoned for at least 15 centuries. It is a ruined fort from 250 to 300 ft. square at top and 80 ft. in height. It is situated close to the village of Lauriya, 15 miles north-north-west of Bettiah and 10 miles from the nearest point of the Gaṇḍaka river. The ancient remains consist of a handsome stone pillar surmounted by a lion and inscribed with Aśoka's edicts, and of

1. S. Beal, Buddhist Records of the Western World, Vol. II, p, 78 & fn. 101.

2. Cunningham. Anc. Geog. India, p. 448.

three rows of earthen barrows or canonical mounds of earth, of which two rows lie from north to south and the third from east to west. They are the sepulchral monuments of the early kings of the country prior to the rise of Buddhism and that their date may be assumed as ranging from 600 to 1500 B. C."[1]

From the above passage it is clear that Janakapura is nowhere mentioned as the capital of Mithilā. But, Cunningham adds; "The modern town of Janakapura, in the Mithari district, is acknowledged by the universal consent of the natives to be the same place as ancient Janakapura, the capital of Mithilā[2]. It also corresponds exactly with the position assigned by Hwen Thsang (Yuan Chwang) to *Che-shu-na*, the capital of the Vriji". He is, however, doubtful about "the correct rendering of the name" (*Che-shu-na* for Janakapura). "But if the bearing and distance recorded by the Chinese pilgrim are correct, it is almost certain that the capital of the Vṛiji in the seventh century B. C. must have been at Janakapura".[3]

The pilgrim's account is confused and it does not make "the bearing and distance" clear. He refers to "an old city on the west"—about 100 li north-east from this spot—"on the west of which is a *stūpa* built by Aśoka-rāja" where "Buddha, when living in the world, preached the law for six months and converted the Devas.".[4] Nowhere in Buddhist litarature we have mention of Buddha's going to

1. Ibid. pp. 448-49; Cunningham, Arch. Surv. Ind. Rep. Vol. I (1862-3-4), p. 69 ff.

2. Also cf. PHAI[6]. 118; Law, Tribes in Ancient India, 240; Jhā Com. Vol. 380-84; Rhys Davids, Buddhist India, p. 19.

3. Anc. Geog. Ind. 445.

4. Beal. II, 80.

Janakapura. Even the name 'Janakapura' is not referred to in the Buddhist literature. We have numerous descriptions of Videha in Jātaka-stories, of which Mithilā is said to have been the capital. The theory also lacks support from the Epics and the Purāṇas. The Rāmāyaṇa[1] describes Viśālā or Viśālāpurī and Mithilā[2], but makes no reference to Janakapura. It gets no support from archaeological sources either.

The place where Aśoka built a stūpa was probably Lauriya Navandagarh, referred to above, or somewhere in the vicinity. It would, therefore, appear from Cunningham's statement that the capital-seat of the ancient Videhan Kingdom was situated in Vedic times and afterwards somewhere in modern Champaran. The discovery of one of the small punch-marked coins believed to be "as old as 1000 B. C. and perhaps even older", in the excavations carried on the site by Major Pearse[3], and that of a gold plaque[4] in recent times said to be of the Vedic age also confirms our assumption.

1. I. 41, 10; 1. 47, 11-7; Mbh. VII. 55;XII. 20; XIV. 4, 65-86; Vā. 86. 3-12; Vṣ. IV. 1, 15-9; Gar. 1. 138. 5-13; Bhāg. IX. 2, 23-36; Bḍ. III. 61, 3-18; Mārk. 109-36 etc.

2. cf. the preceding pages.

3. Arch. Surv. Ind. Rep. Vol. I p. 70, 69-74.

4. cf. Quraishi, Ancient Monuments of Bihar & Orissa (Chapter on Lauriya Navandagarh).

Tradition current in Champaran says : "Rājā Janaka lived at Cānkīgarh (Jánakīgarh), 11 miles to the north of the mound, while his sister was married in Lauriyā, and that the site of her dwelling is called Nandangarh, because she was the **nanada** or husband's sister of the Rājā's consort." (CDG. 163).

Excavations were carried on by Bloch in four of the mounds: He says : "only broken fragments of pottery and stone vessels turned up.

THE JANAKA DYNASTY

Aśvaghosa thinks that Janaka, even as a house-holder, attained merit leading to final bliss[1].

According to Bhavisya Purāṇa, Nimi's son Mithi founded a beautiful city which was named Mithilā after him. From the fact of his having founded the city he came to be known as Janaka[2] (begetter, creator).

Ray choudhuri believes that it was possibly not a personal name but a family designation[3].

The gold leaves may be looked upon as specimens of the ancient **niska,** pieces of gold worn as ornaments and used as coins likewise. The ancient **smasana** was to the north of the town or village and the connection between the first and third mounds at Lauriyā and **smasana,** described to us in the Vedic ritual, can not be doubted. The mounds of Lauriyā likewise lie north of Nandanagarh, which may have been the citadel of an ancient city that once existed at that place." (Vide— Reports, Arch. Surv. Ind. Vols. I, XVI & XXII; Reports, Arch. Surv. Ind. Bengal Circle, 1901-02 & 1904-05; V. A. Smith, Kusinārā and other Buddhist Holy places, JRAS. 1902; CDG. 161—67.)

1. Buddha-Carita. IX. 20 :

ध्रुवानुजो यो बलिवज्रबाहू वैभ्राजमाषाढ़मथान्तिदेवम्
विदेहराजं जनकं तथैव (रामं) द्रुमं सेनजितश्च राज्ञः ।

Also cf. Law, Some Kṣatriya Tribes, p. 132.

2. "निमेः पुत्रस्तु तत्रैव ' ' पुरिजननसामर्थात् जनकः स च कीर्तितः"; Bhāg. IX. 13, 13, (the story of the founding of Mithilā); Matsya. Chap. 55.

3. PHAI[6]. 54; The Vāyu (89. 23.) Says:

"धृतेस्तु बहुलाश्वोऽभूद् बहुलाश्वसुतः कृतिः
तस्मिन संतिष्ठतै वंशो जनकानां महात्मनाम्"

For Janaka as a dynastic designation see also Mbh. III. 133, 17; Rām. I. 67, 8; I. 5. 3; Bhāg. IX. 13. Similarly the name Aśvapati was also a family designation, (Rām. VII. 113. 4.)

According to Pargiter, "from Mithi, the kings were also styled 'Janaka' and this was the family name, for he was the first king Janaka and the Janakas are expressly mentioned as a family··Many are individually so named"[1].

According to another writer Mithi was born out of the attrition of the dead body of his father. He was called Janaka on account of his extraordinary birth and resplendent genius[2].

Wilson defines "Janaka" as "a father, a progenitor, sovereign of Mithilā, and father of Sītā"[3].

Dowson takes Janaka "to be one so named from being born without a progenitor—the first Janaka—twenty generations earlier than Janaka, the father of Sītā[4]".

The author of Ain-i-Akbari views that he was so named because he cared for his subjects as a father does for his children[5].

The name Janaka ascribed to Mithi by some scholars because of his being a 'city-builder' is not convincing. But 'Janaka" taken in the sense of a father gets confirmation from Ajātaśatru's remark in course of a conversation between him and Gārgya Bālāki that learned people "go to Janaka's court saying that Janaka (Vaideha) is indeed Janaka" (father, patron) and runs to him (to acquire the

1. AIHT. p. 96; See also Ram. 1, 71. 4:

"तस्य पुत्रो मिथिर्नाम मिथिला येन निर्मिता
प्रथमो जनको नाम जनकादप्युदावसुः"

2. Jha. Com. Vol. 378. The Commentator of the Taittirīya Saṃhita explains the adjective Vaidehī by विशिष्ट-देह-सम्बन्धिनी 'having a splendid body', (cf. VI. II. 298; Keith, I, 138).

3. Skt.-Eng.-Dict. Pt. I, 679.

4. Classical Dictionary, 132.

5. Ain (Ed. Jarrett), I 679.

knowledge of Brahman) crying "to Janaka, to Janaka, let us go"[1]. The derivation, however, underwent a change and the entire dynasty of the Mithilā monarchs came to be called "Janaka-vaṃśa" ("*Vaṃśo Janakānāṃ Mahātmanānāṃ*"- the family of the high-souled Janakas). This view looks convincing, for we have not one but many Janakas. In the Rāmāyaṇa two different Janakas—one Mithi's son and the other Hrasvaromā's son, Sītā's father are mentioned[2]. The Jātakas refer to several Janakas. Moreover, the term 'Janaka" has a reference to the tribe, *jana*[3] and the best or the leader of the Janas was called Janaka.

Under a series of calamities the Kurus and the king of Hastināpura had to leave the country[4]. Janamejaya's fourth

1. Br. Up. II. I. I :

"स होवाचाजातशत्रुसहस्रमेतस्यां वाचि दद्मो
जनको जनक इति वै जना धावन्तीति"

SBE. XV. (Upaniṣads, pt. II) p. 100 : Ajātaśatru said—"Verily all people run away, saying Janaka (the King of Mithilā) is our father (patron)" ; Also cf. Kauś. Up IV. I.

2 Rām. I. 71. 4 : "तस्य पुत्रो मिथिर्नाम मिथिला येन निर्मिता, प्रथमो जनको नाम····"

"स्वर्णरोमणस्तु राजर्षेर्ह्रस्वरोमा व्यजायत
तस्य पुत्रद्वयं जज्ञे धर्मज्ञस्य महात्मन:
ज्येष्ठोऽहमनुजो भ्राता मम वीर कुशध्वज:"

(Vs. 12-13. Sīradhvaja Janaka, father of Sītā narrates his family-tree); The Gauḍīya Rāmāyaṇa (V. 36,20) Says :

"जनकानां कुले जाता राघवाणां कुले वधू:"

See also Rām. VII. 45 4 ; Vā. 89, 6 & 15.

3. cf. Latin **genus** ; Gr. **genos** (Vide—Triveda, p. 45).

4. PHAI[6], p. 45; see also Chān. Up. 1-10, 1-7; Br. Up. III, 4. For earlier vicissitudes, see Rv. X, 98 (drought in the time of Saṃtanu); Mbh. I, 94 (story of Saṃvaraṇa) ; Devībhāgavatam X, 13, 110 ; JRAS. 1911, p. 510 ; VI. II, 119 ; Bhandarkar, Car. Lec. 1918, pp. 26-27 ; IHQ. 1933, 253.

successor abandoned Hastināpura and made Kausāmbī his capital, because, it is said, Hastināpura was carried away by the Gaṅgā. Pargiter, however, takes this explanation to be inadequate and suggests that manifestly he was obliged to abandon all the northern part of the Gaṅgā-Yumunā Doāb[1]. There can be no doubt that he was driven south by pressure from the Punjab. This retreat mixed up the Kurus of Hastināpura with the southern Pañcālas and led to the combination of the Kurus and Pañcālas (including the Śṛñjayas). The Kurus in the succeeding ages played a minor part in the politics of north-eastern India. The centre of learning and culture now shifted from Hastināpura to Videha. While the power of the Kurus was waning, that of the Videhas was waxing. The succeeding age was dominated by the most notable figure, Janaka, the philosopher-king of Mithilā mentioned in several Vedic texts.

The Videhan dynasty was descended from Ikṣvāku's son Nimi (Nemi) who is called Videha, and was the branch of the Solar race. It has been mentioned in five Purāṇas[2]. Its earlier part down to Sīradhvaja is given in the Rāmāyaṇa[3]. All are in substantial agreement down to Sīradhvaja except the Garuḍa Purāṇa which omits the first two kings and makes Udāvasu of this dynasty son of Prasuśruta of Ayodhyā. The Purāṇas fairly agree about the rest of the genealogy except that after Śakuni, the Viṣṇu, Garuḍa and Bhāgavata insert twelve kings—Arjuna

1. AIHT. 285.

2. Bḍ. III. 64, 1-24; Vā. 89, 1-23; Vṣ. IV. 5, 11-14; Gar. I. 138, 44-58; Bhāg. IX. 13.

3. Rām. I. 71. 3-20; VII. 57. 18-20.

to Upagupta—whom the Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa omit. The Purāṇas, however, supply us with a complete list of the kings of this dynasty. They generally agree that Kuśadhvaja was Sīradhvaja's younger brother and king of Sāṅkāśya. It is again here that the Bhāgavata confuses the genealogy and makes Kuśadhvaja son of Sīradhvaja. But the Viṣṇu and Vāyu record that he was his brother, and not son. The statement in the Bhāgavata, therefore, may be rejected[1].

Some scholars suggest that if Māthava Videgha was the founder of the royal line of Mithilā, Nemi (Nimi) Sāpya cannot claim that distinction[2]. Nimi has been mentioned in several Vedic texts,[3] but he is nowhere shown as the founder of Mithilā. His son Mithi founded a capital which was afterwards named after him—Mithilā (c. 3000 or 3323 B.C.)[4]. King Nami Sāpya of the Vedic texts may be identified with Nami of the Jaina Uttarādhyāyanasūtra[5], Nemi of the Viṣṇu Purāṇa[6] and Nimi of the Makhādeva Sutta[7], the Kumbhakāra Jātaka[8] and the Nimi Jātaka[9].

1. CAI. 138.
2. PHAI.[6] 55.
3. Rv. VI. 20. 6. (Prāvannamī sāpyam); X. 48. 9 (Prame Namī sāpyam); I. 53. 7 (Namyā yadindra Sakhyā); VI. I. 436; Pañcaviṃśa Brā. XXV. 10. 16-18 (Story of Namī Sāpya—"Vaideho rājā")
4. cf. Triveda, 46; JBRS. XXXII. Pts. 3-4, pp. 82-83.
5. SBE. XLV. 37 (Namipravrajyā).
6. IV. 5. 13
7. Majjhima Nikāya. II. 32, 74-83 : The same story is here narrated with slight variations. Nimi was like Makhādeva. Indra with other gods came to him and praised him. When Nimi reached the Assembly Hall of the gods, he was received cordially by Indra, and sent back to his kingdom in a celestial chariot.
8. No. 408, Cowell. III. 228-30.
9. No. 541, Cowell. VI. 53-68.

The name Nimi or Nemi stands alone in the entire dynastic list of the Janaka Vaṃśa though the name is often spelt differently in different texts. Unlike 'Janaka' the name is used nowhere for more than one person. Ray chaudhuri, however, believes that the title Nimi may have been borne by several kings besides Ariṣṭa or his son. On the basis of Nimi Jātaka which describes Nimi as having been "born to round off" the royal family "like the hoof of a chariot's wheel", he even takes Bahulāśva, the father of Kṛti, with whom the dynasty ended, to be one among those kings who bore the title of Nimi[1]. The Viṣṇu Purāṇa, however, may have confounded the names Arista and Nemi and put forward the two kings as one[2]. The Nimi of the Purāṇa thus can be no other than the Nimi of the Vedic texts. By virtue of his superior position in the family, he was probably responsible for the foundation of the royal line which came to be known in the succeeding ages after his son, Mithi.

Ariṣṭa (Nemi) is also identified with Ariṭṭhajanaka of the Mahājanaka Jātaka[3]. This identification is, however, doubtful. Ariṣṭanemi's predecessor was Rtujit and successor Śrutāyus. But the Mahājanaka Jātaka[4] mentions Ariṭṭhajanaka as having been preceded by his father Mahājanaka (Mahājanaka I ?) and succeeded first by his brother Polajanaka and, after his death, by his son Mahājanaka II.

1. PHAI6, pp. 55, 57, 81-82.
2. Rhys Davids, Dialogues of the Buddha, III, 193.
3. No. 539, Cowell VI. 19-37 ; PHAI6, 57.
4. Ibid ; cf. B. C. Sen, "Studies in Jātakas" in JDL, (Cal. Un.) 1930, p. 14. It is suggested that the Makha of the Jātaka (No. 541) may be identified with Mithi of the Purāṇas.

The list of the names of the kings supplied by the Purāṇas is very long. There are altogether fifty-four kings there including the later Videhas[1]. There may have been many more names which have been either overlooked or deliberately left out. None of these names except Sīradhvaja and Kṛti can be identified with the Videhan monarchs mentioned in the Vedic, Purāṇic, Buddhist or Jaina literature. D. S. Triveda has given short accounts—culled mostly from Jātaka stories—of some of the kings of this line—Nimi, Mithi, Sīradhvaja, Ariṣṭajanaka, Mahājanak II, Aṅgati, Suruci, Sādhīna and Kalāra[2]. It is clear that the writer has here mixed up the early Videhan kings with the later ones.

SIRADHVAJA JANAKA

Hrasvaromā had two sons, Sīradhvaja and Kuśadhvaja. Sīradhvaja was the elder and Kuśadhvaja, the younger[3]. Sīradhvaja is identified with Janaka II, the father of Sītā. Ray chaudhuri, however, believes that the Janakas from Sīradhvaja down to Kṛti were the later Videhas and began to rule the kingdom of Videha six generations--150 or 180 years--after the time of Janamejaya Pārīkṣita[4]. He further holds that the great Janaka of the

1. cf. Dowson, 313.
2. Triveda, 46-62 ; JBRS. XXXVII, Pts. 3-4, pp. 84-100.
3 Rām. 1, 71, 12 :

"ज्येष्ठोऽहमनुजश्चायं भ्राता मम कुशध्वजः"

4. PHAI[6]. 51, 80 : The above statement so explicitly mentioned in the fourth edition of the same book (pp. 43-44) is vaguely recorded in its sixth edition.

Vedic texts was Sīradhvaja. He, however, does not consider it 'as certain'' because of the "doubtful historical and chronological value'' of the Purāṇic lists[1].

Janaka, mentioned in connection with Yājñavalkya, cannot be identified with the father of Sītā. This identification would go against many well-established synchronisms in traditional history and would fail to account for the period of Rāma and the subsequent Ikṣvākus[2]. Yājñavalkya was not the friend and contemporary of Sītā's father. Sīradhvaja had defeated and killed the king of Sāñkāśya and installed his brother Kuśadhvaja on the throne there. It is, therefore, clear that Sīradhvaja Janaka, father of Sītā and the contemporary of the Ikṣvāku king Daśaratha, Rāma's father, and Atithigva Divodāsa was not the great philosopher-king of the Vedic texts. That they (from Sīradhvaja to Kṛti) were later kings is further

1. IHQ. VIII, pp. 600 ff; PHAI[6]. 56. He adds—"As the name Aśvapati is also apparently given to Bharata's maternal uncle, it seems that it was possibly not a personal name but a secondary epithet or a family-designation like Janaka. In that case it is impossible to say how far the identification of the Vedic Janaka with the father of Sītā is correct".

Keith also identifies Sīradhvaja with the Vedic Janaka cf. CHI. Vol. I. 122-23. See also Weber, Hist. Ind. Lit. 135; Vaidya, Hist. Skt. Lit. I, p. 18; Law, Some Kṣatriya Tribes, 133; Upādhyāya, Prācīna Bhārata kā Itihāsa (Hindi) p. 51.

Bhavabhūti also accepts the identification of the Vedic Janaka with the father of Sītā (Mahāvīra-carita, I. 14; II. 43):

"तेषामिदानीं दायादो वृद्धः सीरध्वजो नृपः

याज्ञवल्क्यो मुनिर्यस्मै ब्रह्मपारायणं जगौ"

Also see Uttara-rāma-carita, IV. 9.

2. The Vedic Age, 326; Sen, "Studies in Jātakas" in JDL. 1930, p. 13.

ruled out by the fact that Janaka, Rāma and Sītā are all mentioned in Vedic literature at different places[1].

Sīradhvaja's son was Bhānumanta[2]; his son was Śatadyumna[3] whom the Vāyu calls Pradyumna[4]. His son was Śuci[5], called Muni in the Vāyu[6]. Śuci-Muni had a Son Urjavaha after whom we have Sutadvaja, the Satvaradhvaja of the Viṣṇu and Sanadhvaja of the Bhāgavata. Sanadhvaja-Sutadvaja-Satvaradhvaja had a son named Śakuni in the Vāyu, but Kuṇi in the Viṣṇu, the name being omitted in the Bhāgavata. From Kuṇi the Janaka dynasty branched off into two lines one of which is preserved in the Vāyu and the other in the Viṣṇu. The Viṣṇu, however, after finishing the list it has taken to describe, comes round and describes the Vāyu list and introduces minor modifications[7].

The following is the list of kings from Nimi down to Sīradhvaja Janaka who ruled Mithilā and about whom all the Purāṇas are in substantial agreement except the Garuḍa which omits the first two kings and makes Udāvasu of this dynasty son of Prasuśruta of Ayodhyā :

(1) Nimi[8], (2) Mithi[9], (3) Udāvasu, (4) Nandivardhana, (5) Suketu, (6) Devarāta, (7) Bṛhadratha (or

1. Bulke, Rāmakathā (Hindi), 6-9 ; cf. also Rv. 1. 126. 4; X. 93. 14 The Daśaratha-Jātaka No. 461.
2. Vāyu. 89. 18 ; Vṣ. IV. 5. 12.
3. Vṣ. IV. 5, 14 ; Bhāg. IX. 13. 12.
4. 89. 19.
5. Bhāg. IV. 13. 22 ; Vṣ. IV. 5. 13.
6. 89. 19.
7. cf. CAI. 139.
8. Vṣ—idehVa
9. Vṣ—Janaka I-Mithi,-Mithilā,-Videha

Bṛhadukhta), (8) Mahāvīra[1], (9) Sudhṛti[2], (10) Dhṛṣṭaketu, (11) Haryaśva, (12) Maru, (13) Pratīndhaka[3], (14) Kīrttiratha[4], (15) Devamīḍha[5], (16) Vibhudha[6], (17) Mahīdhraka[7], (18) Kīrttirāṭa, (19) Mahāromā, (20) Svarṇaromā[8], (21) Hrasvaromā and (22) Sīradhvaja (Janaka II).

KṚTI JANAKA—THE GREAT PHILOSOPHER-KING

Hiraṇyanābha's pupil Kṛta or Kṛti, was no other than Kṛti, the son of Bahulāśva of the Janaka dynasty. Kṛti Janaka and Yājñavalkya, therefore, belonged to the same time as both of them were the pupils of Hiraṇyanābha, Yājñavalkya having learnt Yoga from him[9]. Yājñavalkya was thus the friend and contemporary of Kṛti Janaka a descendant of Sīradhvaja Janaka in the eighteenth generation.

Ray choudhuri says, the identification of this great Janaka (Janaka-Videha) is "very difficult" and the "most knotty of all problems"[10]. He is also of the opinion that

1. Vṣ—Mahāvīrya
2. Vṣ—Satyadhṛti
3. Vṣ—Pratibandhaka or Pratīpaka
4. Vṣ—Kṛti (ta) ratha
5. Vṣ—Devamīḍha (Kṛti)
6. Vṣ—Viśruta-Visṛta
7. Vṣ—Mahādhṛti (Kṛti)
8. Vṣ—Suvarṇaromā
9. cf. CAI. 131-39 ; 141-43 ; Annals, XIII, 323 ff.
10. PHAI[4]. 68. The expression has been omitted in the sixth edition of this book.

the great Janaka was later than the Pārīkṣitas (Janamejaya, Śrutasena, Ugrasena and Bhīmsena). On the basis of an evidence derived from Vedic literature he concludes that Janamejaya and his brothers must have passed away before Janaka Videha[1], although the epic-tradition that Uddālaka and his son Śvetaketu attended the Sarpa-satra[2] of Janamejaya and the Purāṇic tradition that Janamejaya's son and successor Śatānika learnt the Vedas from Yājñavalkya go towards proving the contemporaneity of Janamejaya and Janaka (Kṛti). Janamejaya Pārīkṣita was a contemporary of Hiraṇyanābha Kausalyāyana and, therefore, was an older contemporary of Janaka and Yājñavalkya[3], This also shows that Janaka was not separated by five or six generations from Janamejaya. On the contrary, it is more probable that Turkāvaṣeya[4], the priest of Janamejaya stands at the 6th step in the series of teachers above Yājñavalkya and Janaka, placing Yājñavalkya only a step

1. Ipid, (sixth Edition), p. 48 ff. Bhujyu lāṭyāyani tested yājñavalkya with the question—"kva Pārikṣitā abhavan ? ("whither have the Pārisṣitas gone ?'—Br. up. III. 3-1 ; E. Roer. Br. up 20). To this Yājñavalkya answered—"Thither where all the Aśvamedha sacrificers go." This, according to Ray chaudhuri, shows that Janamejaya and his brothers "must at that time have passed away, yet their life and end must have been still fresh in the memory of the people." (p. 49). He further adds : "as Sātyayajñī flourished long after Indrota Daivādi Saunaka his contemporary Janaka must be considerably later than Janamejaya, the contemporary of Indrota ' (p. 50) ; for contrary views cf. Annals XIII, pp. 309 ff.

2. Mbh 1. 53. 7 ; 1. 60. 7:

3. cf. CAI, ff 160, 131-34 ; Aupals, XIII, pp. 317-20 ; 323-24.

4. Sat. Brā. X 6, 5, 9 ; XIV 3. 2. 32.

above Janaka[1], in conformity with several Epic, Purāṇic and Vedic synchronisms. Turkāvaṣeya probably lived to a great age to officiate as the priest of Janamejaya, just as Vyāsa Pārāśarya lived to a great age to attend Janamejaya's court[2].

Pargiter is also of opinion that king Kṛta (Kṛti) of the Dvimīḍha line was the disciple of Hiraṇyanābha or Hiraṇyanābhi Kausalya and made twentyfour saṃhitās of Sāman and was one step below Hiraṇyanābha[3]. From the Viṣṇu and Vāyu Purāṇas also we learn that a certain king Kṛti was the disciple of Hiraṇyanābha and taught his disciples twentyfour Saṃhitās[4]. According to the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad Yājñavalkya and a certain Janaka were great friends and both learnt from each other[5]. This Janaka

1. CAI. 159. Raychaudhuri, however, suggests that Janaka was separated five or six generations from Janamejaya, because "in the lists of teachers given at the end of the tenth book of the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa and the sixth chapter of the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad Turakāvaṣeya, the priest of Janamejaya appears as a very ancient sage who was tenth in the ascending line from Sāñjīvīputra, whereas Yājñavalkya and Uddālaka Aruṇi, the contemporaries of Janaka, were only fourth and fifth in the ascending line from the same teacher" (Vide-PHAI[6], 50-51).

2. CAI. 160. For different views cf. Annals, XIII. pp. 311 ff; IHQ. 1932, 600-05; PHAI[6], 51 fn. etc.

3. AIHT. 173.

4. Vṣ. III, 6, 7.

"हिरण्यनाभशिष्यश्च चतुर्विंशतिसंहिता:
प्रोवाच कृतिनामासो शिष्येभ्य: स महामति:"

Vā. 61. 44 :

"ततो हिरण्यनाभस्य कृतशिष्योनृपात्मज:"

5. IV. 1-4.

also performed a Bahudakṣiṇa sacrifice. On this occasion there was a great debate in the court of the Maithila king. Yājñavalkya emerged as the greatest philosopher--all others who had participated in this debate having been defeated by him. Uddālaka Āruṇi, the famous Pañcāla scholar, was also one of the participators. From the Mahābhārata[1] we know that Uddālaka and Veda were great friends, and that Janamejaya Pārīkṣita, the grandson of Abhimanyu, had approached Veda to become his priest[2]. These evidences, when read together, clearly point to Uddālaka, Veda, Janamejaya, and Hiraṇyanābha as having been contemporaries. This is further supported by the fact that Yājñavalkya not only learnt from Hiraṇyanābha[3] and Vaiśampāyana[4] but also from Uddālaka Āruṇi[5]. The great philosopher king of the Vedic texts was, therefore, no other than Kṛti Janaka, the pupil of Hiraṇyanābha and a great friend of Yājñavalkya. Yājñavalkya, the pupil of Hiraṇyanābha, therefore, was a contemporary and a great friend of Kṛti, the pupil of Hiraṇyanābha, and both belonged to the same time[6].

Hiraṇyanābha Kausalya, the *hotā* of king Aṭnāra[7] and Hiraṇyanābha, the proposer of some mystic questions to

1. I. 3. 21-22.
2. Ibid. 1. 3. 62.
3. Vā. 88, 208; Bhāg. IX. 12. 3; Bḍ. III. 64. 208; Vṣ. IV, 4. 48.
4. Vā 61, 13-18; Bḍ. II. 35, 18-21; Vṣ. III. 5. 1-2; Bhāg. XII. 6. 61-62.
5. Bṛ. Up. VI. 3. 7; 5. 3.
6. Buddhist India, 26.
7. Sāṃ. Srau. Sūtra, XVI. 9. 13.

Sukeśa Bharadvāja[1] were the same person[2]. The Mahābhārata[3] and the Rāmāyaṇa[4] record another tradition. It is said that Bṛhadratha Janaka., the son of Devarāṭa who flourished before Sīradhvaja, asked certain mystic questions to Yājñavalkya. The latter narrated how he acquired the Yajus from the Sun, and how he composed the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa[5]. This would place Yājñavalkya and the composition of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa in the hoary past[6]. There are, however, arguments against that. Bālhīka—the son of Pratīpa and the brother of Śantanu is referred to in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa[7]. Śatānika-the son and successor of Janamejaya,learned the Vedas from Yājñavalkya[8]. The Bṛhadāraṇyaka[9] refers to the Pārikṣitas and the Mahābhārata[10] also says that Uddālaka, a prominent figure in Janaka's court attended the Sarpa-Satra (the Snake-sacrifice) of king Janamejaya along with his son Śvetaketu. These statements are no doubt conflicting, but we know that all these persons are mentioned in the Śatapatha and other Brāhmaṇas. The statements, when read together, tend towards proving the contemporaneity of Hiraṇyanābha, Yājñavalkya and Kṛti Janaka. Yājñavalkya, therefore, can not be supp-

1. Praśna Up. VI. 1; Vā. 99. 179.
2. Vide—A. S. Altekar's Presidential Address to the Archaic Section, Calcutta, 1939. p. 13.
3. XII. 315, 3-4.
4. I. 71, 6.
5. Mbh. XII, 323.
6. Vide—Triveda, 65.
7. XI. 11, 3, 3.
8. Vṣ. IV, 4, 48.
9. III. 3, 1.
10. I. 53, 7.

osed to be a contemporary of Bṛhadratha as it would go against established historical traditions. Moreover, we have no mention of the latter in the Brāhmaṇas and the Upaniṣads. The epic statement, therefore, need not be given much credence.

Rhys Davids[1] is inclined to identify Janaka (Kṛti Janaka), the great philosopher-king of Mithilā with Mahā-Janaka of the Jātaka[2]. The utterance of Mahājanaka II of that Jātaka :--

"Mithilā's palaces may burn
but naught of mine is burned thereby"[3]

reminds us of the great philosopher-king. The Jaina Uttarādhyāyana Sūtra attributes this saying to Nami[4], probably identical with Mahājanaka II. Some scholars identify the Vedic Janaka with Mahājanaka I of the Jātaka[5]

1. Buddhist India, 26.
2. No. 539.
3. Ibid; Fausboll, VI. 56:

"सुसुखं वत जीवाम येसं नो नऽत्थि किंचन
मिथिलाय डय्हमानाय न मे किंचि अडय्हथा ति"

In the Mahābhārata (XII. 17. 18-19; 219. 50) the same saying is attributed to Janaka Janadeva of Mithilā.

"मिथिलायां प्रदीप्तायां न मे दह्यति किंचन"
"अपि च भवति मैथिलेन गीतं
नगरमुपाहितमग्निनाभिवीक्ष्य
न खलु मम हि दह्यतेऽत्र किंचित्
स्वयमिदमाह किल स्म भूमिपालः"

("Seeing his city burning in a fire, the king of Mithilā sang of old, 'in this conflagration nothing of mine is burning' ".)

4. SBE. XLV, 37.
5. PHAI[6], 57.

But it seems that the Vedic Janaka (Kṛti Janaka) is identical with Mahājanaka II of the Jātaka[1].

Some scholars think that the identification of Kṛti of the Purāṇas with Karāla Janaka who brought the line of the Videhan kings to an end is more reasonable[2]. But from Aśvaghoṣa's Buddha-carita we learn that one Karāla Janaka carried off a Brāhmaṇa's daughter and brought about his ruin thereby.[3] Kṛti Janaka, the great philosopher-king can not be identical with a king who is represented as a debauch. Moreover, in the same book[4] we are told that "Janaka" reached the position, attained by none other, of instructing the twice-born in the methods of Yoga. Karāla, therefore, must have been a later king who by his shameless deeds brought an end to this line.

If according to a Purāṇic tradition we place Pārīkṣita in the 14th century B. C., we must place this Janaka in about the middle of the 12th centry B. C.[5]. This is plausi-

1. Sen, "Studies in Jātakas" in JDL, 1930, p. 13.
2. PHAI[6], 81; The Vedic Age, 326; Pusalker, following Pargiter, takes Karāla to be identical with Ugrasena Janaka, "though this name does not occur in the dynastic lists." (Ibid. 327).
3. IV. 80:

   "कराल जनकश्चैव हृत्वा ब्राह्मणकन्यकाम्

   अवाप भ्रंशमप्येवं न तु सेजे न मन्मथम्"

   Also cf. XIII, 5; SBE. XLIX, 45; Hemacandra. Yogaśāstra, p. 160.
4. I. 45: "आचार्यकं योगविधौ द्विजानामप्राप्तमन्यैर्जनको जगाम"; Also see XII, 67.
5. cf. Rhys David's formula for assigning a period of about 150 years to the five Theras or Elders from Upali to Mahinda (Buddhist Suttas, Int. XLVII); PHAI[6], 51, fn. 3.

ble keeping in view the place of Janamejaya, only a step above Janaka and the time of the composition of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa. The thoery that, "if we accept a date for Guṇākhya Śāṅkhāyana, the pupil's pupil of Uddālaka according to the Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka, in the sixth century B. C., we must place Parīkṣita in the 9th century B. C., and Janaka in the 7th century B. C."[1], is not convincing. The Bṛhadāraṇyaka[2] clearly mentions Yājñavalkya as the pupil of Uddālaka Āruṇi. Kahoḍa was the pupil of the same Uddālaka and was, therefore, the contemporary of Yājñavalkya. Guṇākhya was the pupil of Kahoḍa and, therefore, ranks only a step below Yājñavalkya. Yājñavalkya was the author of many Yajuṣes in, and compiler of the White Yajurveda. This would place Guṇākhya in the very beginning of the Yajurvedic period. He could not evidently have been the Gṛhya-Sūtrakāra, for Gṛhya Sūtras, as a class of literature, are of later date[3]. Moreover, if we treat Guṇākhya as contemporary with Āssalāyana Sāvathi and Gautama Buddha, and therefore with Prasenjit and Bimbisāra, it would bring down Kahoḍa and Yājñavalkya only a step above Gautama Buddha. Yājñavalkya, however, can not belong to the time of Gautama Buddha. Guṇākhya lived far earlier than Gautama Buddha[4].

Kṛti Janaka was the most notable figure of his age. A great patron of philosophy and learning his court was thronged with Brahmaṇas---Aśvala, Jaratkārava, Yājñavalkya, Bhujyu lāhyāyani, Uśasti, Kahoḍa, Gārgī, Vācaknavī,

1. PHAI[6], 52.
2. VI. 3, 7; 5, 3.
3. Annals, XIII, p. 314.
4. Ibid. 314; CAI. 123-24; AIHT. 182; Weber, 52-53; SBE. XII, Intro. XXXV—XXXIX.

Uddālaka Āruṇi--from Kosala and Kuru countries. The king of the east thus collected at his court the celebrities of the west much as the intellects of Athens were collected at the court of the Macedonian kings[1].

The Sāṅkāśya Line

King Sudhanvā of Sāṅkāśya invaded Mithilā, the capital of Sīradhvaja Janaka[2]. Sīradhvaja fought and killed him. He then placed his brother Kuśadhvaja on the throne of Sāṅkāśya. It is also said that Sīradhvaja himself invaded Sāṅkāśya and killed Sudhanvā[3]. It appears, however, that Sudhanvā was a powerful, ambitious king with a lust for conquest. He attacked Mithilā, and was killed in the battle[4]. Kuśadhvaja's accession to the throne of Sāṅkāśya clearly marks a distinct branch-line of the Janaka dynasty. There were at least six kings who ruled Sāṅkāśya after Kuśadhvaja. This Sāṅkāśya is said to have been situated near Mathurā, perhaps on the river Ikṣumatī[5].

Kuśadhvaja became an ascetic at an early stage of his life and retired to forest for meditation[6]. He was the uncle of Sītā. His two daughters—Māṇḍavī and Śruti-

1. Oldenberg, Buddha, 398.
2. I. 71.
3. AIHT, 275.
4. Rām. I. 71. 15-18.
5. AIHT. 275 fn. : It has been identified with Sankisa or Basantpur situated on the northern bank of the river Ikṣumati or Kālindī in Etah district (Vide—De, p. 177 : Triveda, p. 50, fn. 2).
6. Rām. I. 71, 13,

kīrtti were married to Bharata and Śatrughna -- Rāma's step-brothers respectively[1]. It is also suggested that Kuśadhvaja was the king of Kāśī No mention is, however, made of any kings of the Middle region except Kāśī among the names of the kings invited to attend Daśaratha's sacrifices[2]. The king of Kāśī in the time of Daśaratha was Divodāsa, the father of Pratardana. Kuśadhvaja as a contemporary of Daśaratha and Divodāsa could not have been the king of Kāśī. We have also a reference to a sanguinary battle between Janaka and Pratardana the the son of Divodāsa[3]. This Janaka was probably Sīradhvaja, or Kuśadhvaja, or some of their successors. This does not show that Kuśadhvaja was, or became afterwards, the king of Kāśī.

Dharmadhvaja was the son of Kuśadhvaja[4]. He had two sons—Kṛtadhvaja and Mitadhvaja. Kṛtadhvaja had a son named Khāṇḍikya. There was a fight between Keśidhvaja and Khāṇḍikya[5]. This was probably a war of succession.

The identity of Khāṇḍikya is doubtful. Khāṇḍikya the enemy of Keśidhvaja is sometimes identified with Khāṇḍika, the enemy of Keśin of the Baudhāyana Śrauta Sūtra[6]. "Khāṇḍika' is however, a patronymic derived from Khaṇḍika. Keśin Dārbhya (or Dālbhya) was the.

1. Dowson, 172.
2. AIHT, 276.
3. Mbh. XII. 99. 1-2.
4. Bhāg. IX. 13. 19.
5. Ibid. IX, 13. 21· Vṣ. VI. 6. 10.
6. XVII. 54; CAI, 138.

king of the Pañcālas[1]. He learnt from Khāṇḍika, the son of Udbhāra, the method of atoning for a bad omen at a sacrifice[2]. He was also the author of a Sāman[3], and was taught by a golden bird[4]. In the Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā the name is given as "Saṇḍika"[5], probably a corrupted form of "Khāṇḍika".

The Purāṇas finish the Sāṅkāśya line with Keśidhvaja and Khāṇḍikya. It is probable that Sāṅkāśya was divided between the last two descendants of Kuśadhvaja[6]. It is difficult to account for the sudden disappearance of this line from the Purāṇic texts. The mysterious end of the line was probably the result of the fratricidal war and the ceaseless endeavour on the part of some of Sudhanvā's descendants to regain their lost throne. It is, therefore, natural that the Bhāgavata Purāṇa prolongs, though wrongly, the Janaka dynasty by interweaving the Sāṅkāśya line into the Mithilā line between Sīradhvaja and his son Bhānumanta.

Relations with Neighbouring Powers

It is said that the three seats of Vedic culture—Kosala, Kāśī and Videha—sometimes confederated themselves[7]. Para, the son of Aṭnāra[8] figures as a king of Kosala and

1. Jaim. Up. Brā III. 29. 1, et. seq.
2. Sat. Brā XI. 8. 4. 6.
3. Pañca. Brā XIII. 10-18.
4. Sāṅkh. Brā. VII. 4.
5. I. 4. 12.
6. CAI, 143.
7. Mookerji, Hindu Civilisation, p. 89 ff.
8. Sāṃkh. Srau. Sūtra, XVI. 9. 11-13; Pañca. Brā. XXV. 16. 3; Sat. Brā, XIII. 5. 4. 4; Talava. Up. Brā. II. 6. 11; Tait. Saṃ. V. 6. 5, 3,

Videha and Jala Jātukarṇya is mentioned as a Purohita of the Kosalas, Kāśīs and Videhas[1] in the time of Śvetaketu, a contemporary of Janaka Videha (Kṛti Janaka). The territories of Kosala and Videha were probably not allied so closely as those of the Kurus and the Pañcālas. Para is spoken of as a king of Videha and also of Kosala[2]. This shows that the two kingdoms were sometimes united under one sovereign. The Rāmāyaṇa speaks of the friendly relations between the kings of Kosala, Videha and Aṅga[3]. The marriage of Sītā, daughter of Sīradhvaja, with Rāma, son of Daśaratha, is a strong evidence of the cultural relation subsisting between the two countries. Moreover, Aśvala, the hotri priest of Janaka was a citizen of kosala[4].

Kāśī and Videha are connected also in the Kauśītaki Upaniṣad. This may indicate a temporary league of these powers. This is possible also because of their geographical position[5]. There were some differences and rivalry between them and the Kuru-Pañcālas[6]. Weber thinks that the Kāśīs and Videhas together constituted the Uśīnaras—a very rare name in Vedic literature[7]. The suggestion is wrong, for the Uśīnaras dwelt in the Middle region. Moreover, the Janaka mentioned in the Sathibhasta Jātaka[8] said to have been reigning in Banaras, can not be the Janaka of

1. Sāṃkh. Srau. Sūtra XVI, 29. 5-6; Also cf. PHAI6. 74.
2. CHI, Vol I, 122.
3. cf. AIHT, 276.
4. Weber. 52-53.
5. Bṛ. Up. III. 8. 2; Also cf. CHI, Vol. I, 122 VI. Vol. I, 154.
6. cf. The Vedic Age, 327.
7. Weber, 68.
8. No. 402.

the Upaniṣads, for Ajātaśatru was then on the throne of Kāśī.

After the Bhārata war, it is said, the Brahmadatta family ruled over Kāśī[1]. This family is supposed to be of Videhan origin[2]. This is doubtful. Ajātaśatru, the contemporary of Janaka, the philosophor-king, probably belonged to the Brahmadatta family[3], and Videha and Kāśī were not on friendly terms during this time[4]. Himself a great philosopher, Ajātaśatru was, however, jealous of Janaka's fame as a patron of learning and culture. He may have had a hand in overthrowing the Videhan monarchy[5]. It is absurd to identify the Ajātaśatru of the Vedic texts with the Ajātaśatru of the Buddhist literature. It may be that Ajātaśatru of Magadha later borrowed the popular epithet associated with the king of Kāśī[6].

1. Matsya. 273, 71; Vā. 99, 454 :

"शतं वै ब्रह्मदत्तानां

वीराणां कुरवः शतम्"

2. PHAI[6], 75-76: Also cf. The Mātiposaka Jātaka (No. 455) and the Sambula Jātaka (No. 519).
3. PHAI[6]. 76-77.
4. The following passage in the Bṛ. Up. (III. 8. 2.) probably refers to frequent struggles between the heroes of Kāśī and Videha :

'यथा काश्यो वा वैदेहो वा उग्रपुत्र उज्ज्यम् धनुर् अधिज्यं कृत्वा द्वौ

वाणवन्तौ सपत्नातिव्याधिनौ हस्ते कृत्वोपतिष्ठेद्"

("As the Ugra's son from Kāśī or from Videha strings the slackened bow and rises with two foe-piercing arrows in his hand"—cf. Winternitz, Ind. lit. Translation I, 229.).

5. PHAI[6], 83.
6. CHI, I, 122-23.

The early Videhas were generally on friendly terms with the Kekayas, the Kāśīs and the Kuru-Pañcālas. Kṛti Janaka of Videha, Aśvapati of Kekayas (in the Punjab), Ajātaśatru of Kāśī, Pravāhaṇa Jaivali of Pañcāla and other Brāhmaṇas from Kuru-Pañcāla country disputed with each other in the instructions of the Brāhmaṇic philosophy. But before the Bhārata war the relations between the Videhas and the Kurus were strained. The Mahābhārata[1] says that after Yudhiṣṭhira's accession to the throne of Indraprastha, Bhīma defeated the king of the Videhan people in course of his Digvijaya. We have also references to Karṇa's conquest of Mithilā and Pāṇḍu's defeat of the kings of Daśārṇa, Mithilā, Kāśī and other countries[2]. In the great Bhārata war the Videhas sided with the Kauravas[3]. Kṛṣṇa along with Bhīma and Arjuna visited Mithilā on their way from Indraprastha to Rājagṛha[4]. Kṛti Janaka's successors negotiated matrimonial alliances with the kings of Kosala and Magadha. They were related to the king of Vaiśālī who was also one of the sons of Ikṣvāku[5].

The Gandhāra Jātaka gives an account of the friendly relation between the king of Videha and Gandhāra[6]. The

1. II. 30.
2. Mbh. I. 113. 28.

"ततः कोषं समादाय वाहनानि च भूरिशः

पाण्डुना मिथिलां गत्वा विदेहाः समरे जिताः"

Also cf. II. 29; IHQ. VII, 522-26.

3. cf The Vedic Age, 302; JIH, V, 37.
4. Mbh. II. 20.
5. Ram, 1. 47; II. 17; Vā. 86. 16-22; Vṣ. IV. 1. 48.
6. No 406; Cowell, VI. 222.

Mahā Ummagga Jātaka[1] describes at length a long fight between a Videhan king and king Śaṅkhapāla. The same Jātaka also portrays the picture of a sanguinary battle between a Videhan king and Culāni Brahmadatta of Uttara-Pañcāla in the kingdom of Kampila.

THE LATER VIDEHAS

The Purāṇas close the Videhan dynasty with Kṛti. We have, however, mention of some of his descendants who ruled Mithilā. It is possible that after Kṛti the authors of the Purāṇas deliberately omitted the names of his successors who were insignificant compared with their predecessors. The successors of Kṛti were weak and hardly capable of upholding the power and prestige of the family.

Kṛti's son was Ugrāyudha. He killed Pṛṣata's grand-uncle Nīla and was anxious to marry Satyavatī after the death of Śantanu[2]. He was consequently killed by Bhīṣma Śāntanava in a fight[3]. Ugrāyudha probably belonged to the line of Dvimīḍha.[4]

The Mahābhārata[5] relates the story of Kahoḍa, the pupil of Uddālaka, the father of Śvetaketu. Uddālaka gave his daughter Sujātā in marriage to Kahoḍa. She had a son named Aṣṭāvakra. Once in the court of a certain Janaka Kahoḍa was discomfited in a debate by the court-paṇḍita

1. No 546.
2. Hv 1. 20, 44; Vā. 99. 292.
3. Hv. I, 20, 35.
4. CAI. 142.
5. III. 132.

Vandin. Kahoḍa was kept in confinement and after twelve years he was released by his son, Aṣṭāvakra This Janaka is identified with Ugrasena or Aindradyumni, son of Indradyumna or Janadeva[1]. It is probable that Upagupta or Ugragupta and Ugrasena were the same person. He ruled over one of the two principalities into which Videha was divided by the two branch-dynasties that issued from Kuṇi. This reminds us of the similar division of Sāṅkāśya between Keśidhvaja and Khāṇḍikya[2].

The Bhāgavata Purāṇa includes Vasu after Upagupta[3]. Ananta of the Bhāgavata, Śasvata of the Viṣṇu and the Svagata of the Vāyu were the same person[4]. The kindom of the last king Vasu of this branch-line probably passed into the hands of the descendants of Kṛti Janaka. But we have no information about them. The dynasty appears to have receded into oblivion after him.

We have a reference to a Videhan king, Janaka Janadeva, referred to above, who gave up his hundred teachers and followed Pañcaśikha, the first disciple of Āsurī. The latter was himself a disciple of Yājñavalkya who taught

1. Mbh. XII. 17. 18-19; 219 50
2. CAI., 143.
3. IX. 13. 25. The Jaina Harivaṃśa, a very late work written in imitation of the Brāhmaṇical Harivaṃśa, inserts the famous king Vasu as the descendant of Mithilānātha, the king of Videha (XV. 67). It is said, king Vasu died because he sacrificed animals. The Cetiya Jātaka (No. 442) mentions Vasu as Upacara or Apacara, evidently a corrupt form of the name Uparicara, preserved in the Purāṇas and the Mahābhārata. Pargiter's theory about the conquest of Cedī by Vasu is not unreasonable. The identity of Vasu as a descendant of the king of Videha is controversial and the Purāṇas present conflicting evidences (Vide-CAI, 62-64).
4. CAI., 140.

him Mokṣa. Janaka Dharmadhvaja was his disciple[1]. He may be identified with the son and successor of Kuśadhvaja. The identity of Janaka Janadeva is not known. He was perhaps one of the successors of Kṛti Janaka. Nothing definite, however, can be said from such obscure references.

It is said that until the time of Mahāpadma, the exterminator of all the Kṣatriyas, there reigned contemporaneously for the same length of time 24 Ikṣvākus, 27 Pañcālas, 24 Kāśīs, 36 Kurus and 28 Maithilas[2]. On a rough calculation the period of these kings' rule comes from c. 850 down to c. 382 or c. 326 B. C. when Mahāpadma exterminated them[3]. The theory does not seem correct. We know it for certain that monarchy disappeared in Mithilā and was immediately followed by a republic prior to the rise of Buddha and Buddhism (c. sixth century B.C.) In the succeeding ages Mithilā comes into picture as an important constituent of the Vajjian confederacy which suffered serious reverses at the hands of Ajātaśatru. The theory under review probably refers to the conquest of the Maithilas, along with the Licchavis and others, by Mahāpadma. The Maithilas apparently occupied a small district to the north of the Vajjian country annexed by Ajātaśatru[4]. They probably flourished as a small tribal republic isolated

1. AIHT, 329.
2. DKA, 24:

   "कलिंगाश्चैव द्वात्रिंशद् अश्मका: पञ्चविंशति:
   कुरवश्चापि षट्-त्रिंशद् अष्टाविंशति मैथिला:" ।

3. AIHT, 181-82; PHAI6, 234, fn 1.
4. Ibid. 234, fn. 1.

from the Vajjian confederacy after the decline and fall of the latter.

It is suggested that on the eve of the Bhārata war, the famous king Virāṭa reigned in Mithila[1]. He founded the city of Virāṭapura after his name, whose ruins still exist in the village Virāṭapura in the Bhālā paraganā of Darbhanga district. Kīcaka was his brother-in-law who was killed by Bhīma. There is yet a place known as Kīcakavāhā. The suggestion deserves consideration although the place over which this king ruled has been identified by scholars[2] with Bairāṭa in the Jayapur state which is said to have comprised the Matsya territory, now the parts of Alwar, Jayapur and Bharatpur. But the tradition current in Mithilā is that the village Virāṭapura was the actual site of the kingdom of Virāṭa. It is said, the Pāṇḍavas passed one year incognito there. The Bairāṭa in the Jayapur state would be much closer to Hastināpura, the capital of the Kauravas. It is difficult to believe how the Pāṇḍavas lived, even in disguise, so near their enemy, the Kurus, who were always on search for them.

It may be argued that the identification of Bairāṭa with the present Virāṭapura in Darbhanga is not possible as the latter was situated at a distance. The problem of distance need not disturb us, for the Mahābhārata abounds in references to Pāṇḍavas' wanderings through a wide territory

1. Das, Mithilā-Darpaṇa, Pt. I, pp. 56-58.

2. Bhandarkar, Carm. Lect. 53: PHAI[6]. 66-67: Cunningham, Anc. Geog. Ind. , 387; IA. V, 179; Bomb. Gaz. I, Pt II, 558; JASB, 1895, p. 252; IA., 1882, p. 327. Manu includes the Matsyas in the Brahmarṣideśa (II. 19)

extended up to Gandhāra in the west and Kāmarūpa and Maṇipura in the east.

The Matsya deśa means 'the land of fish'. If the name have any bearing on the tract, we must place Matsya deśa somewhere in eastern India where fish is found more than in the Jayapur-Alwar area.

Buchanan in his Dinajpur Report[1] also refers to a tradition current among the people of the district. It is said that Matsyadeśa or Virāṭa was in ancient times situated in that district.

The headquarter of the district of Morang (Nepal) was named Virāṭanagara in accordonce with this tradition.

A king Alarka is said to have ruled over the territory now known as paragana Nānpur (Darbhanga). He was followed by another king Bali.[2] It is difficult to identify these kings.

1. Cal. Ed. 1833, pp. 19-20 : "..The next personage of this country, who is celebrated in tradition, is Virat (Virāṭa) raj, king of Motsyo De's (Matsya deśa) a name which is still retained by the whole of this district, except a small portion east from the proper Korotoya, for that river separated Motsyo from Kamrup, which was then governed by a prince named Bhogodotto (Bhagadatta) The mother of the Virat raj happened to be impregnated by means of a fish..It is on this account that this vicinity has been called Motsyo De's or the country of the fish."

O'Malley also refers to a popular belief current amongst the people of the district of Champarn. It is said that "within this district lay the Kingdom of Virāṭa mentioned in the Mahābhārata as the tract within which the Pāṇḍavas spent the last year of their weary twelve years' exile, and that its capital, where the five brothers resided a year, was situated at or near a village called Vairāṭī, six or seven miles west of Rāmnagar" (Vide-CDG. 14-15).

2. Das, 58. A tradition current in Dinajpur also says that a king named Boli (Bali) ruled in that region in ancient times (Vide-Buchanan, Dinajpur Report, 18).

The Jātakas tell us about several later Videhan kings. The Suruci Jātaka[1] mentions a king, Suruci whose son was Suruci Kumāra. His son was Mahāpaṇāda. He was a mighty king with his palace all of gold. The Gandhāra Jātaka[2] mentions a Videhan king, Videha. It describes in detail his conversations with Bodhisattva, the king of Gandhāra. The Mahā-Janaka Jātaka[3] speaks of a king named Mahā-Janaka ruling in Mithilā. He had two sons-Ariṭṭha Janaka and Pola Janaka. Ariṭṭha Janaka killed his brother Pola Janaka whose son was Prince Mahā Janaka or Mahā Janaka II. He became king of Mithilā after the sudden death of Pola Janaka. He, however, renounced the world afterwards. His son and successor was Dīghāvu Kumāra.

The Nimi Jātaka[4] says that a certain king Mahādeva ruled over Mithilā and renounced the world at the later stage of his life. After him came Nimi who was "born to round off" the family "like the hoop of a chariot-wheel". His son was Kalāra or Karāla Janaka. He also renounced the world and brought this line to an end. The Jātaka accounts are so confused that it is very difficult to arrive at any definite results regarding the identity of these kings. The Mahānārada-Kassapa Jātaka[5] speaks of a Khattiya (Kṣatriya) king of righteousness named Aṅgati who ruled Mithilā. The

1. No. 489.
2. No. 406.
3. No. 539.
4. No. 541; Fausball, VI. 96: "महाराज अयं कुमारो तुम्हाकं वंसं घटेन्तो उपन्नो तुम्हाकं वंसो हि पञ्चवज्जनवंशो इमस्स परतो न गमिस्सतीति'.
5. No. 544.

Mahā-Ummagga Jātaka[1] states that a certain king, Videha ruled Mithilā and fought stubbornly against Cūlani Brahmadatta of Uttara-Pañcāla. There was another king, Sādhīna[2] whose virtues and goodness were praised by all. The Śāṃkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra[3] mentions a Videhan king, Para Ahlāra. Among the kings who fought against the Pāṇḍavas there was a king Kṣemadhūrti, usually identified with Kṣemāri of the Viṣṇu and Kṣemadhī of the Bhāgavata.[4] The Mahābhārata[5], however, knows him as the king of Kalutas.

The Gilgit MSS.[6] say that the Videhan monachy existed even during the time of Bimbisāra. The Videhan king had 500 amātyas with Khaṇḍa as the chief. But this statement is controversial. We shall deal with this particular problem in the following section.

FALL OF THE VIDEHAN MONARCHY

The Jaina and Budhist texts[7] show how the Videhan kings, one after another, renounced the world nnd became ascetics without caring for their kingdom or people. Their higher philosophical and spiritual persuit practically de-

1. No. 546.
2. Sādhīna J. No. 494.
3. XVI. 9. 11.
4. Singh, 17.
5. VIII. 5.
6. Ed. Nalinaksha Datta, Vol III. Pt. II, Intro. XV; Also cf. R.C. Majumdar, "Historical Materials in Gilgit Mss." in B.C. Law Vol. Pt. I, pp. 138-39.
7. The Uttarādhyāyana Sūtra, The Mahājanaka Jātaka, The Nimi Jātaka etc, referred to in the preceding pages.

tached them from the realities of the world without which no administration can last long. Patrons of learning and culture, the earlier Videhan monarchs were also great warriors. But the later V dehas, it seems, were too much influenced by Buddhism to take up arms against their enemies. Their extreme moral, philosophical, and religious outlook was responsible for the dying out of their fighting genius. They were now unable to face any external invasion like the successors of Aśoka in a later age. Their detached outlook and renunciation of the world must account for the deterioration that set in the mighty fabric of the Videhan kingdom resulting in its collapse.

The later kings of Videha preferred luxury to the welfare of the people. It is said that Karāla Janaka[1] carried off a Brāhmaṇa's daughter and brought about his ruin thereby. Kauṭilya also remarks: "Bhoja, known also by the name Dāṇḍakya, making a lascivious attempt on a Brāhmaṇa maiden perished along with his kingdom and relation, so also Karāla, the Vaideha"[2]. The significance underlying these references is obvious. The erstwhile leaders of thought and culture had now become intellectualy bankrupt. The preachers of morality and enlightenment had taken to a life full of vices. Karāla or Kalāra was attacked and killed by his subjects because of his immorality and wickedness. The Karāla episode brought about a revolution which

1. Aśvaghoṣa, Buddha-carita, IV. 80· cf. The Vedic Age. 327.

2. Arth. 1. 6: "दाण्डक्यो नाम भोजः कामाद् ब्राह्मणकन्यामभिमन्यमानः सबन्धुराष्ट्रो विनाश करालश्च वैदेहः".

Also cf. Shamsāstry, p. 11.

began a new age in the history of northern India[1]. "The downfall of the Videhas reminds us of the fate of the Tarquins who were expelled from Rome for a similar crime. As in Rome, so in Videha, the overthrow of the monarchy was followed by the rise of a republic."[2]

There is also reason to believe that Kāśī people had a hand in the overthrow of the Videhan monarchy, for, already in the time of the Great Janaka (Kṛti Janaka) Ajātaśatru of Kāśī showed his jealousy of Janaka's fame. Quarrels between the two powers were quite frequent. The Suruci Jātaka[3] says that Brahmadatta, a king of Kāśī, declined to marry his daughter Sumedhā to the Videhan prince. This enraged the latter's father. The Mahābhārata[4] also refers to a great battle between king Janaka of Mithilā and king Pratardana of Kāśī. As a result of these wars, it is suggested, a junior branch of the royal family of Kāśī established itself in Videha[5]. This theory, however, lacks support in the ancient literature.

The Videhan monarchs had often to face hostility of other powers. The sanguinary battle between Cūlani Brahmadatta of Uttara-Pañcāla and a certain king of Videha is a pointer in that direction.[6] The frequent foreign invasions gradually shattered the fabric of the Videhan kingdom.

1. cf. Jayachandra Vidyālaṅkara, Bhāratīya Itihāsa kī Rūpa-rekhā, 310.
2. PHAI[6], 83.
3. No. 489.
4. XII. 99. 1-2; Also cf. Bṛ. Up. III. 8. 2.
5. PHAI[6], 84.
6. The Mahā-Ummagga Jātaka, No 546.

It is also possible that the internecine struggles between the successors of the different branches to sieze power accompanied with the palace intrigues and mutual jealousies hastened up its disruption. The flight of Khaṇḍa, the chief Agrāmātya of the king of Videha to Vaiśālī, because of the jealousies and conspiracies of other ministers to destroy him[1] amply bears out our assumption.

The fall of the monarchy, it seems, was immediately followed by the establishment of a republic in Videha, The Karāla episode and the revolution following it clearly manifest the republican spirit of the time. The Jātaka-stories and other legends connected with it show that Karāla Janaka was the last king of this line. The suggestion that the Vajjian confederation was organized after the fall of the royal house of Videha[2] is based on Buddhaghosa's Pālī Commentary Param-attha-Jotikā[3] (c. 450 A. D.). It says that the Licchavis succeeded Janaka's dynasty as the strongest political power in that region.

The Rāmāyaṇa[4] presents the Videhan and the Vaiśālī monarchies as existing side by side. The Vaiśālī monarchy was probably a later establishment. We have no mention of it in the Śatapatha or other Brāhmaṇic literature. The Mahābhārata[5] also mentions the dynasty. The list is, however, carried not beyond Pramati, contemporary of Daśaratha, king of Ayodhyā and Sīradhvaja, king of Videha up

1. B.C. Law Vol., Pt. I, p. 34ff; Gilgit Mss. Vol. III, Pt. II, Intro. XV.
2. PHAI[6], 84; Triveda, 33.
3. Vol. I, 158-165.
4. I. 47-48,
5. VII. 55; XII. 20; XIV. 4. 65-86.

to the time of the Bhārata war (c. 1450 B. C.). Calculating backward at the rate of 15 years for a reign on the average we may assign 1900 B C. to the extinction of the Vaiśālī monarchy. From Nābhānediṣṭha to Pramati there were thirty-four kings in the dynasty. The house of Vaiśālī, therefore, may have been founded in c. 2410 B. C.

Only four Purāṇas[1] —Vāyu, Viṣṇu, Garuḍa and Bhāgavata--give us a complete list of the kings. The Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa[2] narrates the story of these kings at great length, but only down to Rājyavardhana. The last king of the dynasty was Sumati (c. 1900 B.C.). After this we do not hear of Vaiśālī for several centuries. Videha is, however, frequently mentioned in the Epics and the Purāṇas. It appears that the Ikṣvāku line of Vaiśālī faded out and its territory merged with that of Mithilā.

The Buddhist and Jain texts refer to Videha and Vaiśālī as a single geographical and political unit in some places and as different units in other places. Videha is often used in a wider sense to include Vaiśālī also. The Ācārāṅga Sūtra[3] places the *saṃniveśa* of Kuṇḍagrāma near Vaiśālī in Videha. Mahāvīra's mother was Videhadinnā, Videhadattā (given in marriage by the ruler of Videha) and Ajātaśatru's mother was Vedehī, Vaidehī (daughter of Videha).

That Videha was a monarchy in the time of Bimbisāra[4] is doubtful. It probably flourished as a republic in the

1. Vā. 86. 3-12; Vṣ. IV. 1. 15-19; Gar. 1. 138. 5-13; Bhāg. IX. 2. 23-36; Bḍ. III. 61. 3-18.
2. 109-36.
3. II 15, 17; SBE. XXII. Intro.
4. Vide—Gilgit Mss, Vol. III, Pt. II, Intro XV; B.C. Law Vol. Pt. I. pp. 138-39.

sixth century B. C. and soon afterwards it constituted a part of the Vajjian confederacy. Nowhere does it figure as a part of the Licchavi republic. In the Abhidhānappadīpikā[1] (12th century A. D.) both Vaiśālī and Mithilā find a place in a list of twenty famous cities. The Uvāsagadasāo[2] (c.454 A.D.) mentions the ruler of Mithilā along with others with the epithet "Jiyasattu", probably a common designation of kings like Devānaṃpiya of the Aśokan inscriptions (c. 250 B.C.). These rulers are said to be the contemporaries of Mahāvīra. But at the same time the name of Videha appears in the list of the ten republics including Vaiśālī. They are "actually referred to by name in the oldest Pāli records. These republics occupied in the sixth century B. C. the whole country east of Kosala between the mountains and the Gaṅgā[3]." It is interesting "to notice that while tradition makes Videha a kingdom in earlier times it describes it in Buddha's time as a republic. Its size, as a separate kingdom, is said to have been three hnndred leagues (about twenty-three hundred miles) in circumference. Its capital, Mithilā, was thirty-five miles north-west from Vaiśālī, the capital of the Licchavis".[4]

The Vaiśālī republic was probably established in 750 B.C., long after the Bhārata war. It came to an end at the hand of Ajātaśatru (c.525 B. C.), immediately after the nirvāṇa of Lord Buddha. In the following period Mahāpadma is said to have exterminated the Maithilas along with other

1. This work was composed in 1153-1186 A.D. (Vide—Bharata Sinha Upādhyāya's Pāli Sāhitya kā Itihāsa, p. 615); PHA[16], 198.
2. Ed. Hoernle, II, pp. 6, 64, 100, 103, 106, 118, 166.
3. CHI. I. 175.
4. Buddhist India (2nd Ed), 18-19; HP[2]. 31, 53.

peoples (c.326 B. C.). It is thus possible that the Videhas, like the Licchavis, maintained their independent character even two hundred years after the fall of the Vajjian confederacy.

Pāṇini[1] refers to the Vṛijis proper. Kauṭilya[2] distinguishes them from the Licchavikas. Yuan Chwang also draws a distinction between the *Fu-li-chih* (Vṛiji) country and *Fei-she-li* (Vaiśālī). He says: "the country of the Vṛijjis or Saṃvṛijjis, ie. the united Vṛijjis, was that of the confederated eight tribes of the people called the Vṛijjis or Vajjis, one of which, that of the Licchavis, dwelt at Vaiśālī. They were republicans"[3]. The Vaidehis of Mithilā, according to Cunningham, were one of the eight branches of the Vṛijji tribe and the district of Vaiśālī was "limited to the south-west corner of the country of the Vṛijjis to the westward of the little Gaṇḍaka river"[4]. A Buddhist tradition also mentions city proper (Vaiśālī) as consisting of three districts[5]. These districts were probably at one time the seats of three different clans.

The above account shows that Videha and Vaiśālī flourished as republics independently in the sixth century

1. IV. 2. 131 : "मद्रवृज्योः कन्"
2. Ch. XI. 376-79. Kauṭilya by mentioning the Licchavis separately, means **the Videhas only**. by the term 'Vṛijis' (Vide-HP[2],53). The Videhas are treated as a republic by Patañjali also (Keilhorn. Vol. II, pp. 268-69). He says : "क्षत्रियादेकराजादिति वक्तव्यम् । किं प्रयोजनम् । संघप्रतिषेधार्थम् । संघान्माभूत् पञ्चालानामपत्यम् विदेहानामपत्यमिति । . . . . अथ क्षत्रियग्रहणं किमर्थम् । इह मा भूत् । विदेहो नाम ब्राह्मणस्तस्यापत्यं वैदेहिः । "
3. Beal, II, 77, fn. 100.
4. AGI., 445-46.
5. Rockhill, Life of Buddha, 62.

B.C. The Videhan republic probably came into existence earlier and may have contributed towards the growth and development of the republic in Vaiśālī. The Vajjian confederecy was affected when the need for defence against the rising Magadhan imperialism arose.[1] Henceforward Videha comes into picture as an important constituent of it for a long time. It was probably again separated after the disintegration of the Vajjian confederation. But we do not get as clear a picture of the Videhan republic as we get of the Licchavis in the Buddhist and Jain literature.

POLITY

The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa[2] enumerates various kinds of rulership prevalent in different parts of India in those days. In the eastern quarter the king was anointed as a *Samrāṭ* (overlord)[3]. In the southern quarter the king of the Satvatas was anointed as a permanent ruler (*Bhoja*)[4]. In the western quarter the kings of the southern and western peoples were anointed as self-rulers (*Svarāṭ*)[5]. In the northern quarter—the lands of the Uttara-Kurus and the

1. HP[2]. 50, 184.
2. VIII. 14.
3. "एतस्यां प्राच्यां दिशि ये के च प्राच्यानां राजानः साम्राज्यायैव तेऽभिषिच्यन्ते सम्राडित्येतानभिषिक्तानाचक्षत"
4. Ibid : 'एतस्यां दक्षिणायां दिशि ये के च सत्वतां राजानो भौज्यायैव तेऽभिषिच्यन्ते भोजेत्येनानभिषिक्तानाचक्षत" : Also cf. Rv. III. 53. 7; Mbh. 1. 84.22.
5. Ibid : "एतस्यां प्रतीच्यां दिशि ये के च नीच्यानां राजानो येऽपाच्यानां स्वाराज्यायैव तेऽभिषिच्यन्ते स्वराडित्येतानभिषिक्तानाचक्षत"

Also. cf. Kaṭh. Saṃ. XIV. 5; Mait. Saṃ. 1. 11. 5; VI: Vol. II 221.

Uttara-Madras beyond the Himavat–the kings were anointed as sovereigns (*Virāṭ*)[1]. In the firm middle the kings of the Kuru-Pañcālas with the Vaśas and Uśīnaras were anointed as kings (*Rājan*)[2]. According to the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa the office of the Samrāj was higher than that of the Rājan[3].

KINGSHIP

Kingship was originally elective[4]. But in course of time it came to be the normal form of government. The first king may have been elecled on certain conditions—on a contract which was enforced subsequently[5]. The ceremonials were invariably observed even when succession to

1. Ibid: "एतस्यां उदीच्यां दिशि ये के च परेण हिमवतं जनपदा उत्तर-कुरव उत्तर-मद्रा इति वैराज्यायैव तेऽभिषिच्यन्ते विराडित्येनानभिषिक्तानाचक्षत"
   Also cf. Ait. Brā. VIII. 17; Sukra (Sarkar's Trans.), 24; Kauṭilya, VIII. 2 etc.
2. Ibid: "एतस्यां ध्रुवायां मध्यमायां प्रतिष्ठायां दिशि ये के च कुरु-पंचालानां राजान: स वशोशीनराणां राज्यायैव तेऽभिषिच्यन्ते राजेत्येनानभिषिक्ताना चक्षत"
   Also cf. Sat. Brā. V. 1. 1. 12; SBE. XLI; Eggeling, Sat. Brā, Pt. III, p. 4. For translation, cf Rg-veda Brāhmaṇas (trans. by Keith) Harvard Oriental series, vol. XXV, pp. 330-31.
3. V. 1. 1. 12-13: "न सम्राट् कामयेत राजा भवितुम् अवरं हि राज्यं परमं साम्राज्यम्"
   Also cf. Kat. Srau. Sūtra, XV. 1. 1. 2.
4. Rv. X. 124. 8 : "ता ईं विशो न राजानं वृणाना बीभत्सवो अथ वृत्रादतिष्ठन्"; Av. III. 4. 2. : "त्वां विशो वृणतां राज्याय"; Also, III. 3. 6; Sat. Brā. IX. 3. 4. 5; Ait. Brā. 1. 1. 14; VIII. 4. 12; Mbh. 1. 94. 49; Nirukta II. 10; VI. Vol II. 211.; Saṃvara J. No. 462; HP.[2] pp. 189-90; Ghoshal, A History of Hindu Political Theories. 1927, p 26 ff; Altekar, State & Government in Ancient India, p. 47ff; Majumdar, Corporate life,[2] pp. 98ff.
5. HP.[2] 192.

throne became hereditary. Elections were held even in post-Vedic times. Inspite of hereditary succession, whenever there was a failure of heir the people elected their sovereign on the basis of merit. The practice of elective kingship was widely current[1].

The Pārīkṣitas and the kings of Janaka's line may be mentioned as instances of hereditary kingship. The expression "*Daśapuruṣaṃrājya*" in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa[2]. means a kingdom lasting through ten generations.

Kingship during the Pārīkṣita-Janaka period was not merely a 'patriarchal presidency'. The monarch was not merely a chief noble, but the first among equals, "president of a council of peers"[3].

In several Vedic texts he is represented as a "master of his people". He claimed "the power of giving away his kingdom" to any one he "liked" and "taxing the people as much as he liked". He surpassed "ordinary mortals". He was surrounded by 'armed warriors and skilled charioteers'[4]. He could "banish a Brāhmaṇa at will, mulct and overpower a Vaiśya at will and exact labour from or slay a Śūdra at will"[5]. In the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad[6] Janaka says to Yājñavalkya : '*so' haṃ Bhagavate Videhān dadāmi māṃ cāpi saha dāsyāyeti*". The consecrated king is called "*Viśvasya*

1. Ibid. 192.
2. XII. 9. 3. 1-3; cf. the reference to the birth of an heir to the throne; Ait. Brā. VIII.9; VIII. 17.
3. PHAI[6] 171.
4. Ait. Brā. III.48; Sat. Brā. XIII. 5. 4. 16; 4. 2. 5.
5. Ait. Brā. VII. 29.
6. IV. 4. 23.

bhūtasya adhipati" ('the lord of all beings') and '*Viśām attā*'[1] ("the devourer of the people"). In a famous laud of the Atharva Veda the rājā of the Kurus is extolled as a *deva*, who excelled mere mortals (*martyas*). Janaka Videha is frequently mentioned as Samrāṭ in the Brāhmaṇas. "The association of the Samrāṭ, whose status was now regarded as higher than that of the Rājan, with the rest, is important. It probably points to the growth of imperialism"[2].

CHECKS

Monarchy by this time had thus established itself on firm grounds, especially amongst the Videhas and the Kurus. It was not absolute however. It was restricted in several ways. Within the frame-work of autocracy certain democratic elements were operative. People's voice in choosing the king; conditions imposed on the king at the time of his coronation; king's dependence on his ministers and the assemblies of the people—the Sabhā and the Samiti or Pariṣad—were definite checks upon his powers. Besides the ministers, *Sūtas* and the *Grāmaṇīs*—also styled *Rājakartṛ* or *Rājakṛt*,[3] i.e., king-makers, would attend meetings of the Samiti. The king along with the people would be present in the Assembly[4]. The most important business of the Samiti

1. Ait. Brā. VIII. 17; The Kauś. Up. (II.6) says: ' राजा त एकं मुखं तेन मुखेन विशोऽत्सि".
2. AHI, 143.
3. "राजकृत: सूत-ग्रामण्य:"–cf. Sat. Brā. III. 4. 1. 7; XIII. 2. 2. 18; The Rāmāyaṇa (II. 67. 2; 79. 1) calls the king-makers "द्विजातय:", cf. also Jaim. Up. Brā. II. 11. 4.
4. Jaim. Up. Brā. III. 7. 6; Chānd. Up. V. 3. 1; Bṛh. Up. VI. 2. 1; cf. also HP.[2] 12-13.

was to elect the Rājan. It could even banish the king and re-elect him. It was constitutionally a soveign body.

POPULAR CHOICE

Kings were at times expelled or even executed along with their unpopular officials. The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa[1] frequently refers to such events. The statements in the Jātakas[2] show that the power of the kings, since the days of Janaka, was very much reduced. The Samiti would function as a national academy[3].

Sabhā was another noteworthy constitutional organisation in the Vedic age and later. It is described as a sister of the Samiti, one of the two daughters of Prajāpati. It was probably the standing and stationary body of selected men working under the authority of the Samiti. "In the Samiti it was the full-fledged democracy of the Gaṇa that functioned, in the Sabhā, the narrow ring, though elected, of the heads of the propertied families that functioned". Monarchy does not seem to have been irresponsible and without control and "the office of kingship, if anything, may be conceded to be sacred, but not the person who happens to hold it"[4].

1. VIII. 10; Sat. Brā. XII. 9. 3. 1 et seq; Eggeling. V. 269.

2. The Vassantara J. (No. 547); The Padakusalamāṇava J. (No. 432); The Saccaṃkira J. (No. 73); The Kaṇḍahāla J. (No. 542); A king of Takṣaśilā (cf. Telapatta Jātaka No. 96) says that he has no power over the subjects of his kingdom. (Vide—Fick, The Social Organisation in North-East India, Trans. by S. K. Maitra, pp. 113-14).

3 HP[2] 14.

4. AMSJ. Vol. III. Pt. II. 505.

The Gilgit Mss.[1] throw an interesting light on the monarchical constitution of Mithilā. The king of Videha is said to have 500 amātyas with Khaṇḍa as their chief (agrāmātya). Khaṇḍa gradually acquired great power and authority in the state. Other ministers got jealous and conspired to destroy him. When he came to know of it, he was afraid and thought–"where shall I go ? If I go to Śrāvastī, it is under a king, and so there would be the same trouble. So would be the case in Vārāṇasī, Rājagṛha and Campā, which are subject to the authority of one person (Ekādhīna). Vaiśālī is under a "gaṇa" (gaṇādhīna). So by all means I must go to Vaiśalī"[2]. This shows that Mithilā enjoyed the "ekādhīna" (subject to one man's authority) form of government when Vaiśālī was under a gaṇa (c. 6th cent. B.C.).[3] The post of Agrāmātya is also mentioned in connection with the kings of Magadha and Kosala though there is no mention of five hundred amātyas in either case. The Jātaka-stories also speak of their "councillors, shining like the moon"[4] and the "temporal and spiritual advisers"[5]. A certain king of Mithilā, Videha, had a temporal and spiritual adviser named Kevaṭṭa. When the army of Cūlani Brahmadatta of Uttara-Pañcāla attacked

1. Vol. III, pt. II. 134.
2. Ibid. cf. Also B. C. Law Vol. Pt. I, 134-41.
3. See pp. 62ff for the discussion of this statement.
4. Mahānāradakassapa J. No. 544.
5. Mahā-Ummagga J. No. 546.

Mithilā, the minister advised the king to check the advancing army of the enemy first by diplomacy and then by force. The minister further suggested that the king should fight and kill Brahmadatta, then, with the two armies, he must attack and sieze another city, and then another, and in this way gain domination over all India and 'drink the cup of victory". After this conquest, they would bring the hundred and one kings to their city and make a drinking bout in the park, seat them there, provide them with poisoned liquor, kill them all, and cast them into the Gaṅgā. Thus they would get the hundred and one royal capitals in their possession, and he (the king) would become king of India[1]. This statement in the Jātaka is significant in that it betrays the black designs for expansion of one's territory in that age. It is, however, difficult to determime the exact nature of the status of these Agrāmātyas and Councillors. It is likely that the body of the five hundred amātyas was a kind of deliberative assembly like the Samiti which worked as a break on the king's activities.

SOCIETY

Most of the social rules and customs that have come down through the ages were formulated and given a definite shape during this period. The society was in a state of fluid. The seeds of some of the most significant developments were sown. These grew into the later rigidity of the caste-system. In the beginning the system of class-division proved healthy and beneficial to the prosperity

1. Ibid.

and smooth working of the society. The leadership, however, soon fell into corrupt hands, and in no time the society was lamed and cut into pieces. Its progress was hampered. It never again witnessed the rise of a Janaka or a Yājña-valkya, a Gārgī or a Maitreyī. The glorious phase of our civilisation received a rude set-back.

The Ṛgveda knew of a hereditary priesthood and nobility. It even refers to the threefold[1] or fourfold[2] division of the people. But this period saw the development of the full-fledged caste-system. Occupations grew in number and variety with the spread of settled life. Contact with aborigines also raised the question of the purity of blood and the colour-bar[3]. The system, however, was not so rigid as in the period of the Sūtras. "It was a mid-way between the laxity of the Ṛgveda and the rigidity of the Sūtras." While the Ṛgvada prohibits marriage between brother and sister, father and daughter—the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa[4] restricts it to relations of the third or the fourth degree. The Brāhmaṇa and the Kṣatriya could marry women of the lower castes including the Śūdra. Sukanyā, the daughter of king Śaryāta, married the Brāhmāṇa sage, Cyavana[5].

During the Brāhmaṇa period the picture of the society looks different. The Brāhmaṇa is described as a "receiver of gifts, a drinker of soma, being always on the move and moving at will".

1. Rv. VIII. 35. 16-18.
2. Ibid, I, 113, 6; X, 90, 12 (The Puruṣa-Sūkta).
3. HC. p. 89 ff.
4. 1, 8, 3, 6.
5. Sat. Brā. IV. 1. 5. 7.

This shows that he attached himself to kings at will. The Vaiśya is "tributory to another, to be lived on by another and to be oppressed at will", i.e., he may be removed from his land at the king's will. The 'Śūdra is the servant of another, to be expelled at will and to be slain at will,'"[1] i. e., he had no rights of property or life against the Kṣatriya or the king. This statement in the Aitrareya Brāhmaṇa clearly refers to the spiritual authority of the Brāhmaṇa who was subject, only in secular matters to the authority of the temporal sovereign. It also points to the Vaiśyas or commoners being denied the right of property and land-holding on the basis of tribute or tax payable to the king in return for their protection by the latter. Grants of lands and slaves came to the Kṣatriyas as gifts from the king for their conquest of the aborigines. The Śūdra was the worst victim of this system which was fully developed during this period and was afterwards idealised in Manu's Code, though with some laxity here and there[2]. He was approximating more and more to the position to which the humbler freeman was being reduced. The Aryans claimed that the Śūdra had no right to approach the burning fire and read the sacred texts. The social barriers between the Brāhmaṇas and the Śūdras were so widened that the performance of tapasyā by a Śūdra, Śambūka, was treated as a capital offence by Rāma, and the Śūdra was killed[3].

1. Ait. Brā. VII. 29; Also cf. CHI, 1, 127-29 ; The Vedic Age, 450-52. Corporate life,[2] p. 347 ff.

2. Weber, Ind. Stud. X, p. 2; The Vedic Age, 449-50.

3. Mbh. X, (Anuśāsana Parva- "Saudramuni-saṃvāda).

Deprived of his land and property the Śūdra was reduced to serfdom. He was often given as presents to the Brāhmaṇas or the ruling classes. Even Janaka, the great philosopher-king of Mithilā, felt no scruples in offering Śūdra slave as gift to the Brāhmaṇas. The Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad[1] says that Yājñavalkya also was the recipient of such gift. In taxational matters also the Śūdra and the Vaiśya had to shoulder the crushing burden as it would not normally fall on Kaṣtriya or Brāhmaṇa.

Change of caste, though unusual, was not impossible in that age. The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa[2] says that Janaka became a Brāhmaṇa through the teachings of Yājñavalkya. There was no inherent distinction between Kṣatra and Brāhmaṇa, The one might change for the other by a change in the mode of life and profession[3]. In the Upaniṣads we have the examples of King Janaka of Videha, King Aśvapati of Kekayas, King Ajātaśatru of Kāśī and King Pravāhaṇa Jaivali of Pañcāla leading in learning and teach-

1. IV 4. 30 ; II 1. 20.
2. XI 6. 2. 10 ; We have the following statement in the Taitt. Saṃ. (VI 6. 1. 4)—"एष वै ब्राह्मण ऋषिरार्षेयो यः शुश्रुवन" ('He who has the learning is the Brāhmṇa ṛṣi') ; also cf. Kāṭhaka, 30. 1; Mait Saṃ. 48. 1 ; 107. 9 :

   "किं ब्राह्मणस्य पितरम् किम् उ पृछसि मातरम्
   श्रुतं चेदस्मिन् वेद्यं स पिता स पितामहः"

   ("What do you ask about Brāhmaṇa father, what do you ask about Brāhmaṇa mother ? Since one who knows the Veda is the father, the grand-father.")
3. Ait. Brā. VII. 19 ; Sat. Brā. XIII 4. 1. 3—" Whosoever sacrifices does so after having as it were become a Brāhmaṇa."

ing the Brāhmaṇa pupils. These instances, however, do not prove inter-change of caste. They only show change of occupation and individual devotion and patronage of learning by some of the kings.

The idea of giving up the world and living by begging is first expressed in the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad. Such begging philosophers were, however, but few. They were mostly Brāhmaṇas[1]. This was soon followed by the theory of four āśramas which came to be established towards the end of the Upaniṣadic period. People at the old age courted forest-life. Yājñavalkya taught his wife Maitreyī the existence of Brahman at the time of going to forest for meditation. This was perhaps not the general practice. The Chāndogya Upaniṣad, however, makes a pointed reference to the three different stages of life.

If the treatment of women is a criterion cf civilization, then the civilization of the Brāhmaṇa texts can expect "only an adverse verdict from posterity."[2] The Brāhmaṇa authors identified the women with Nirṛiti, i. e., evil, and declared that " the woman, the Śūdra, the dog and the cow are falsehood (anṛta) "[3]. Marriage by purchase appears to have been common—if not the rule—in the Brāhmaṇic Age. In deprecation of a faithless wife a Brāhmaṇa text says : "She commits an act of falsehood who *though purchased by her husband* goes about with others ". The question of women freely addressing assemblies was ruled

1. Vaidya, Hist. Skt. Lit. 1, 101.
2. The Vedic Age, 420.
3. Ibid, 420.

out in this age. They could not take an inheritance. Married women of the upper classes had to suffer the presence of rival wives. The monarch was usually allowed to have four queens. Thus, "the culture of the priestly classes was at its lowest ebb in the age of the Brāhmaṇas. But it was still alive though confined within a small coterie."[1]

The Upaniṣadic Age was, however, different. The Upaniṣadic seers not only vitalised the culture "confined within a small coterie" but gave it an altogether different shape. This age saw the rise of many great women-philosophers like Gārgī Vācaknavī and Maitreyī[2]. They participated in the great philosophical deliberations held at the court of Janaka Videha and other contemporary kings. But this was probably not a general feature of the society. A Gārgī or a Maitreyī does not mean that all women were educated. There is Kātyāyanī, the second wife of Yājñavalkya. She represents the ordinary women who were poorly educated. Nevertheless, it appears that no serious restrictions were put on their education and women in their personal capacity could rise to any degree of intellectual height. In the time of Janaka Videha women like Sulabhā and Gārgī were well versed in philosophy and learning and were known as "*Brahmavādinī*". According to Hārīta women were of two classes—*Brahmavādinī* and *Sadyovadhū*[3].

1. Ibid, 420.
2. cf. Great Women of India, 138-39; also see 26-40; for the life of Sulabhā, see Ibid, 199-202; Pandhari-nath Prabhu, Hindu Social Organisation (2nd Ed.), p. 268 ff.
3. Radhakrishnan. Religion and Society, 141; Rv. V. 7. 9; III. 55. 16; Yaju. VIII. 1; Av. XI. 6; AIE 51.

The *Brahmavādinīs* were the products of the educational discipline of *brahmacharya* for which women were eligible. Young maidens completed their education as *brahmacāriṇīs* and then gained husbands in whom "they are merged like rivers in oceans." Unmarried learned and young daughters were married to learned bridegrooms. A daughter who completed her *brahmacarya* was married to one who was learned like her. Maidens qualified by their *brahmacarya*, the disciplined life of studentship, for married life in the second āśrama. But only elderly married women were permitted to hear Vedāntic discourses[1]. Saṃnyāsa was restricted to the retired men and women only. Later on, however, Saṃnyāsa was resorted to by many men and women who wanted to escape punishment or avoid rigours of a house-holder's life.

Poligamy was the order of the day. The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa[2] says that a man could have many wives but no woman could have more than one husband. This is the first clear instance of poligamy which was commom during the Vedic period. Though sanctioned by law it was prevalent only amongst kings and wealthier classes[3]. Even Yājñavalkya could not escape this evil. A king of Videha proudly proclaims—"Ours is a great kingdom, the city of Mithilā covers seven leagues, the measure of the whole kingdom is 300 leagues. Such a king should have sixteen

1. Ait Brā XI. 7.
2. VII. 13 ; III 48 : "Even if there are many wives as it were, one husband is a pair with them" (Vide – Keith, Rgveda Brāhmaṇas, Harvard Oriental Series, XXV, 196).
3. Annals, XII. 144-48.

thousand women at the least"[1]. Apparently a stock-phrase, it, however, betrays the trend of a society where possession of numerous wives was a matter of pride for a man. The position of women generally, therefore, could not have been socially very high. The obligation of chastity bound the weaker sex only. All honour, therefore, to Daśaratha's sons for constancy to their single spouses. Womanhood in the higher orders is "more truly represented by the helpless Sītā[2] than by the stronger minded women".

The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa[3] says that the daughter-in-law did not expose herself to the view of the father-in-law. As soon as he caught sight of her she used to hide herself. The present Maithila society has in this respect remained almost static. The condition of the widowed sister was the same in those days as it is today. They were treated as "hangers-on." They lived upon the charity and sufferance of their brother's wife who was the sole mistress[4].

1. cf. the Suruci Jātaka (No. 489) ; The Mahājanaka Jātaka (No. 539) also says : "the queen Sivate sent for seven hundred concubines and said to them: 'it is a long time, four full months since we last beheld the king; as we shall see him today, do you all adorn yourselves and put forth your graces and blandishments and try to entangle him in the snares of passion" (Cowell, VI, 30-31).
2. For detailed information cf. Great Women of India, pp. 161-68; 240-42 ; for ideal and position of women in domestic life in ancient India, see Ibid. 1-25.
3. XII. 11.
4. Ibid. XIII. 13 : 'तस्मात् समान दया स्वसा अन्योदयार्यंजायाया अनुजीवनी जिति··"

Prostitution, it seems, had already entered the society during the Brāhmaṇa period. Prostitutes were then called "*Viśya*". "*Viśya*" of the Brāhmaṇa period gradually changed into "*Veśyā*" (i. e., one who is approachable to and by all), Concubinage relationship came to be regarded as a more chaste and tolerable form of adultery. Slave-girls were not absent in the harems of the aristocracy. The kings sometimes retained hundreds of slave-girls in their palaces[1]. The story of Śuka, the son of Vyāsa, who was sent by his father to king Janaka of Mithilā to learn more about the practice of the religion of liberation is a significant pointer. How bevies of girls, proficient in all the arts of dalliance and endowed with every feminine accomplishments, surrounded the innocent ascetic--who stood like a log of wood--is in itself an interesting study. Besides, we have the story of Ṛṣya-Śṛṅga. A great sage of Mithilā and son of Vibhāṇḍaka Muni, he was decoyed and seduced by a dazzling beauty employed by Lomapāda (probably his own daughter, Śāntā), the king of Aṅga and a friend of Daśaratha, Rāma's father[2]. This shows that ancient kings probably employed even their daughters for seducing men for political ends.

Ancient Aryans took meat even of forbidden kind. Bhavabhūti's Uttararāmacarita[3] says that calves

1. Sat. Brā. XIII. 5. 2.
2. HPAI. I, 41-46 ; Aśvaghoṣa also refers to this episode in his Buddha-carita (IV. 19) :

   " ऋष्यश्रृङ्ग मुनिसुतं तथैव स्त्रीष्वपण्डितम्
   उपायैर्विविधैः शान्ता जग्राह च जहार च "

3. cf. Saudhātaki—Bhāṇḍāyana—Saṃvāda.

were killed to entertain the guests like Vaśiṣtha at Vālmīki's hermitage. It further states that Janaka did not partake of any kind of meat. The society that is depicted in this book is perfectly in keeping with that of the Saṃhitās, the Brāhmaṇas and the Sūtras which pointedly refer to these customs with great approbation until we come to the Smṛtis which expressly forbid them.

AGRICULTURE

Agriculture continued to be one of the principal occupations of the people. Vast tracts of land covered with dense forests were cleared and made cultivable. There are prayers for ploughing, sowing, growth of corn, rain, increase of cattle, exorcisms against pests, wild animals and robbers.

The main agricultural operations are summed up in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa[1] as "ploughing (*kṛṣanataḥ*), sowing (*vapanataḥ*), reaping (*lunataḥ* and threshing (*mṛṇantaḥ*)." The ripe grain was cut with a sickle (*dātra* or *Sriṇi*), bound up in bundles and beaten out on the floor of the granary. After the threshing was over, grain was seperated from straw by means of a sieve or the winnowing fan (*titau*). The winnower was called " *Dhānyakṛt* " and the grain was measured in a vessel called " *Urdara* ". The corn was then carted into the homes and stored up in granary. It was measured after being stored. The unit of measure was called *khārī*[2].

1. I, 6. 1 3.

2. cf. also The Vedic Age, 461-62.

CROPS

The soil between the Gaṅgā and the Yamunā was fertile. Paddy, (*vrīhi*) barley (*yava*), beans (*mudga, māṣa*), sesamun (*tila*) and grains called *godhūma, masūra* etc. were grown[1]. Their seasons are also mentioned : barley sown in winter, ripened in summer ; paddy sown in the rains, ripened in autumn[2]. There were two harvests a year. The agricultural condition remains even today the same in Mithilā and elsewhere as in those days.

RAINFALL

Agriculture was not all a smooth sailing. Failure or excess of rain caused great anxiety. Moles and birds often destroyed seeds. Rodents, insects and demons damaging crops were exorcised by means of spells. Hailstorms and invasion of locusts were common. The Chāndogya Upaniṣad[3] says that the locusts had badly affected the land of the Kurus, and forced many people to leave their country.

FAMINE

We have references to famines. In the Jātakas there are many stories of famine in northern India. There was a severe drought in the land of the Kosala. There "came a great drought upon the Himālaya country, and everywhere the water dried up, and sore distress fell upon beasts". This pointedly refers to the Maithila country and the adjoining territories.

1. Vāj. Saṃ. XVIII ; cf. also Vaidya, Hist. Skt. Lit. I, 185.
2. Taitt. Saṃ VII, 2. 10. 2 : cf. also Buch, I, 70.
3. I, 10. 1.

TYRANNY

Oppression of the peasantry was not uncommon. In certain villages peasant-proprietors, working in their own fields, were replaced by a class of landlords who obtained possession of all the villages[1]. Common man in course of time, found himself in terror and humiliation.

New occupations of fishermen, fire-rangers, ploughers, washermen, barbers, butchers, footmen, messengers, makers of jewels, chariots, bows, smiths and potters arose[2].

TRADE AND INDUSTRY

Trade and industry flourished. A class of hereditary merchants (*Vāṇija*) came into being. Our authorities show that "from the earliest times the inhabitants of Kosala, Kāśī, Videha, Aṅga, etc. were carrying on trade with countries lying beyond the seas through the sea-ports of Bengal"[3]. There are frequent references to the sea and navigation by sea-going vessels in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa[4]. Videha figures as a place frequented by merchants. People came from Sāvatthī (Śrāvastī) to Videha to sell their ware[5]. The Jātaka stories state that in all great cities of

1. AHI, 47.
2. The Vedic Age, 461-62.
3. AMSJ. Vol. III, Pt. I, 108.
4. XVII. 7-8 : "यो वै संवत्सरस्य अवार च पार च वद
5. Law, Kṣatriya Tribes, 129-30.

eastern India, such as Śrāvastī (capital of Kosala), Vārāṇasī (Banaras), Rājagṛha (capital of Magadha), Campā (capital of Aṅga) and Videha there were merchants, engaged in sea-borne trade. They personally went on voyages. The references to professional acrobats (*Vaṃśa-nartin*) and players on drum and flute on these vessels[1] probably point to the slave-trade, which was carried on by traders.

GUILDS

Merchants had probably their own guilds There are references to *gaṇas* or corporations and the *śreṣṭhins* or aldermen. The word '*Sreṣṭhi*' occurs in several Vedic texts[2] in the sense of a merchant-prince and possibly " headman of a guild ". The term, '*Sraiṣṭhya*' probably implied " the presidency of a guild ".

In the Rgveda the merchants are referred to as *Paṇis*. A merchant prince, Bṛbu is mentioned as "greedy like the wolf," "selfish" and "niggardly."[3]

In the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad[4] the term *Sreṣṭhin* has been used to denote a ' corporation of traders and artisans,"

1. Sat. Brā. II. 3. 3. 5.
2. Ait. Brā. III. 30. 3 ; IV. 25. 8-9 ; VII. 18. 8 ; Bṛh. Up. I. 3. 12 ; Kauś. Up. XXVIII. 6 ; Taitt. Brā. III. I. 4. 10 ; Pañca. Brā. VI. 9. 25 ; XVII. 1. 5. 12 ; Viṣṇu Saṃ. XVI. 25 ; Taitt. Saṃ. I. 8. 10. 2 ; Gautama, X. 49 ; XI. 21. In the Rāmāyaṇa (XIV. 54) we have reference to '**naigma**'. The Mahābhārata has used the word in the sense of a guild of merchants (Vide—JBORS, 1922, Pt. IV, p. 36).
3. Vide—JBORS, 1922, Pt. IV, p. 36.
4. I. 3. 12.

while "the gods of the Vaiśya class were called *ganaśa* on the analogy of their human prototype, because they could earn money by trade, industry and commerce." Thus the existence of trade-associations "which grew partly for economical reasons—better employment of capital, facilities of intercourse—partly for legal interests of their class, is surely to be traced to an early period of Indian culture."[1]

METALS & COINAGE

Many metals were now known and used, e.g., *Hiraṇya* (gold), *ayas* (bronze), *śyāma* (swarthy iron), *loha* (copper), *sīsa* (lead) and *trapu* (tin)[2]. Silver was used in making ornaments,[3] dishes[4] and coins or *niṣka*[5]. There were also definite weights of gold indicating a gold currency—(i) *Aṣṭa-pruḍ* and (ii) *Satamāna*, i. e., weight of hundred Kṛṣṇalas.[6] Commerce was facilitated by the use of convenient units of value like *niṣka* or *hiraṇyapiṇḍa.*[7] It is, however, doubtful that these

1. Fick, The Social Organisation in North-East India, 266. Manu has used the word Sreni. Pāṇini refers to "Sreni" as an assembly of persons following a common craft or trading in a common commodity (Vide—JBORS, 1922. Pt. IV. pp. 38-39) ; Also cf. Majumdar, Corporate Life,[2] p. 15. ff.
2. Vāj. Saṃ. XVIII. 13 ; XI. 3. 1. 7 ; Sat. Brā. V. 4. 1. 2.
3. Sat. Brā. XII. 8. 3. 11 ('**rukma**').
4. Taitt. Brā. II. 9. 7 ; III. 9. 6. 5.
5. Pañca. Brā. XVII. 1. 14.
6. Sat. Brā. II. 5. 5. 16; Kaṭh. Saṃ. XI. 1.
7. AIN. 55-58 ; 63-66 ; cf. also Altekar's article in Sampūrṇānanda Abhinandana-grantha (Hindi), p. 66 ff.

weights had acquired all the characteristics of a regular coinage. *Pāda* was also a type of currency, widely current in those days. The story about Janaka Videha's celebration of a sacrifice in which one thousand cows with ten pādas tied on their each horn were given to Yājñavalkya shows the wide circulation of the *pāda* currency.[1] Pāṇini[2] also refers to 'pāda' as a coin. An inscription[3] of the 10th. century A. D. refers to *pāda* in the same sense. Bhandarkar[4] believes that this *pāda* was undoubtedly a coin circulated in those days. In Janaka Videha's sacrifice, three *Satamānas* were given to every Brāhmaṇa. This indicates that the *Satamānas* were silver coins. The *pādas* were also current in the life-time of Buddha[5].

EDUCATION

The period under review witnessed cultural attainments of a high order. The foundations of whatever is best in Indian culture were laid during this period. It witnessed the growth of a vast and varied literature including the Upaniṣads—" the highest level of intellectual attainments and spiritual progress."[6]

In the Vedic Age, every householder regarded the

1. Sat. Brā. XIV ; Bṛh. Up. III. 1. 1.
2. Sūtra V. 1. 34.
3. Ei. I, 173. 23.
4. AIN., 60.
5. JRAS (N. S.), 1937, p. 76 ff.
6. B. C. Law Vol., Pt. I, 128-29 ; Also cf. Sarkar, Creative India, 4.

education of his children as his sacred duty. No distinction was made between boys and girls. The education of both received the same attention even during its higher stages. Girls were admitted to Vedic school or *Caraṇas.*[1] A *Kāṭhī* denoted the female-student of the *Kaṭha* school. There were also hostels for them, known as *Chātrī-śālā.*[2] In the succeeding ages, however. the marriageable age of a girl was lowered and this adversely affected female-education. The latter part of this period, therefore, speaks of no such talents as Gārgī or Maitreyī or Sulabhā.

Majority of the boys and girls receieved their education at home. For this *Upanayana.*[3] i. e., the *ceremony of initiation* was made obligatory for the *dvijas.* This practice is still prevalent in the same old form. The ceremony was called *ācārya-karaṇa.*[4] Pupils of the same teacher were called "*satīrthyas*"[5] and "*sabrahmacārins.*"[6] They were named after their teachers, such as *pāṇinīyas,*[7] or after their subjects of study, e. g., Vedic *kratus*, *ukthas* and *sūtras*[8]. *Adhyāpaka* or *Pravaktā* was the ordinary term for a teacher as it is today. The specialist in Vedic recitation was called a *śrotiya*[9]. One *caraṇā* might follow

1. Pāṇini. IV, 2. 46 : "चरणेभ्यो धर्मवत्" ; IV. 1. 63 ; AIE, p. 78 ff.
2. Pāṇini. VI. 2, 86 : 'छात्र्यादय: शालायाम्" ; also cf. HC., 123 ; Great Women of India, 87-106.
3. Sat. Brā. XI. 5. 4 ; XI. 5. 4. 17 ; XI. 5. 4. 1 ; Bṛh. Up. VI. 2. 7.
4. Pāṇini. I. 3. 36 : "सम्माननोत्सञ्जनाचार्यकरणज्ञानभृतिविगणनव्ययेषु नियः
5. Ibid. VI. 3. 87 : "तीर्थे ये"
6. Ibid. VI. 3. 86 : "चरणे ब्रह्मचारिणि"
7. Ibid. VI. 2. 37 : "कार्तकौजपादयश्च"
8. Ibid. IV. 2. 59 : "तदधीते तद्वेद"; IV. 2. 60 : " क्रतूक्थादिसूत्रान्ताट्ठक्"
9. Ibid. V. 2. 84 : 'श्रोत्रियश्छन्दोऽधीते"

the system of another *caraṇa*[1]. A teacher usually repeated the text five times. A pupil who learnt it from single recitation was called an *ekasandhagrāhī*.[2] Pupils were graded according to the number of mistakes they committed in Vedic recitation. The limit allowed for such mistakes was fourteen.[3]

The period of studentship was usually fixed at twelve years. They spent twelve years with their preceptors and then returned home[4]. Sometimes a period of studentship for 32 years and 101 years[5] is also mentioned. There were certain conditions binding on them. The student had to live in the house of his teacher.[6] He is referred to as '*ācārya-kula-vāsin*'[7] and '*antevāsin*'.[8] He had to go a-begging.[9] He had to tend the sacred fires,[10] and also the house.[11] He must not sleep during day-time.[12] On

1. Ibid. II. 4. 3. : "अनुवादे चरणानाम्"
2. Ibid. V. 1. 58 : "संख्याया : संज्ञासङ्घसूत्राध्ययनेषु"
3. Ibid. IV. 4. 63-6 : "कर्माध्ययने वृत्तम् .. .. .. तदस्मै दीयते नियुक्तम्"
4. Chānd. Up. VI. 1. 2 ; V. 10. 1.
5. Ibid. VIII. 7. 3 ; VIII. 11. 3 : IV. 4. 5.
6. Av. VII. 109, 7 : "ब्रह्मचर्यं यदूषिम्" ; Sat. Brā. XI. 3. 3. 2 ; Ait. Brā. V. 14. : "ब्रह्मचर्यं वसंतम्" ; Taitt. Brā. III. 7. 63 : "यो वो देवाश्चरति ब्रह्मचर्यम्"
7. Chānd. Up. II. 23. 2.
8. Ibid. III. 11. 5 ; IV. 10. 1 ; Bṛh. Up. VI. 3. 7 ; Taitt. Up. I. 3. 3; II. 1 ; Pāṇini. VI. 2. 36 : "आचार्योपसर्जनश्चान्तेवासी"
9. Chānd. Up. IV. 3. 5 ; Sat, Brā. XI. 3. 3. 5 ; Av. VI. 133. 3.
10. Sat. Brā. XI. 3. 3. 4 ; XI. 5. 4. 5.
11. Ibid. III. 6. 2. 15 ; Chānd. Up. IV. 4. 5. ; Saṅkh. Ara. VII, 19 ; Ait, Ara, III, 1. 6, 3-4,
12, Sat, Brā, XI: 5, 4, 5,

festive occasions he accompanied his teacher and awaited his commands.[1] The pupil, before he was taught the highest knowledge of *Brahman*, must show that he was calm and unperturbed in mind (*Śānta*), self-restrained (*Dānta*), self-denying (*Uparata*), patient (*Titikṣu*) and collected (*Samādita*).[2]

It was not necessary that the higher knowledge of the Upaniṣads be taught in the first period of life. This is clear from the instances of Śvetaketu and Gautama, the pupils of Pravāhaṇa Jaivali, and Janaka, Gārgī and Ārta-bhāga, the pupils of Yājñavalkya.[3]

The courses of training and subjects of study were not uniform for all castes. A 'policy of discrimination' was probably observed so far as the study of the non-Brāhmaṇas was concerned. The Droṇa-Ekalavya (the Niṣāda boy) episode in the Mahābhārata points to the extreme step that a jealous Brāhmaṇa could take to keep down his Śūdra rival.

Formal pupilage and four *āśramas* or life-stages were not binding in the earlier period. This is clear from the

1. cf. Yājñavalkya's order to his pupils to drive away the thousand cows offered to the wisest Brāhmaṇa at the sacrifice of Janaka Vaideha (Bṛh. Up. III, 1, 1-2) ; Chānd. Up. VIII, 15.
2. Bṛh. Up. IV, 4, 23 ; Kaṭha. Up. II, 24 ; Muṇd. Up. I, 2, 13 ; Svet. VI, 22 ; Maitrā. VI, 29 ; X, 22 ; Kaivalya. III, 4 ; Also cf. Chānd. Up. VII, 26, 2 ; Muṇd. III, 2, 6 ; III, 2, 10-11 ; Deussen, Philosophy of the Upaniṣads, p. 73 ; AIE, p. 83 ff.
3. Bṛh. Up. VI, 2. 7 ; II. 4 ; IV. 1-2 ; Chānd. Up. IV. 9. 3 ; V. 3; AIE, p. 133 ff ; Also cf. AMSJ. III, Pt. I, p. 219 ff.

Uddālaka-Śvetaketu-Āruṇeya-story[1] and Yājñavalkya's instructions to his wife Maitreyī, Janaka and Gārgī who were not strictly his pupils.[2] With the advancement of learning education in the family became impracticable. Society began to encourage distinguished scholars to become regular teachers. We have the story of the *"Carakas"* or wandering students.[3] Janaka Vaideha met some wandering Brāhmaṇas[4]—Śvetaketu Āruṇeya, Somaśuṣma, Satyayajñī and Yājñavalkya---whom he asked about the offering of the Agnihotra oblation. Yājñavalkya gave a satisfactory answer. It, however, contained some flaws. Janaka pointed them out and himself explained the offering of Agnihotra. He then put questions to Yājñavalkya and thenceforward became a Brāhmaṇa or Brahmaniṣṭha--having knowledge of Brahman. There were regular organisations for such advanced studies[5] patronised by kings. They were usually known as *"Caraṇas."* The *Prātiśākhya* literature was the product of these *Caraṇas.*

Kṣatriyas also attained higher knowledge of Brāhmaṇic philosophy. It appears, however that only a few selected Kṣatriyas of high rank took real interest in intellectual persuits of the time. Among them the following names are significant—Ajātaśatru of Kāśī[6], Pravāhaṇa Jaivali[7],

1. Chānd. Up. IV, 9. 3 ; V. 11. 7 ; VI. 1. 1.
2. Bṛh. Up. IV, 1-2, 3-4 ; III. 2. 13 ; III, 8 ; II. 4.
3. Sat. Brā. IV, 2, 4, 1 ; AIE, pp. 117-18.
4. Sat. Brā. XI, 6, 2, 1.
5. Bṛh. Up. VI, 2, 1-7 ; Also cf. Chānd. Up. V. 3 ; AIE, 85-88.
6. Kauṣ. Up. IV, 1, 19 : "प्रतिलोमरूपमेव तन्मन्ये यत् क्षत्रियो ब्राह्मणमुपनयेत"
7. Sat. Brā. XIV, 9, 1, 1, ; Bṛh. Up. VI, 1, 1, ; Chānd. Up. I, 8,1; V, 3, 1.

Aśvapati of Kekaya[1], Janaka of Videha, who taught Yājñavalkya[2], Pratardana[3] and others[4].

In the Upaniṣadic Age, Mithilā was the main seat of learning and culture. Brāhmaṇas came from Kuru-Pañcāla to take part in philosophical deliberations. Of learned Kṣatriyas Janaka was the type. He had learnt his different definitions of *Brahman* from six teachers—Jitvan, Udaṅka, Barku, Gardabhīvipīta, Satyakāma and Sākalya. Yājñavalkya taught him the Upaniṣad, a hidden treasure behind those definitions. The Kauṣīṭaki Upaniṣad[5] says that Janaka's generosity was a constant source of disappointment to Ajātaśatru of Kāśī. A conference was organised by Janaka of Videha at the time of his horse-sacrifices (*Aśvamedha*). All the learned men of the Kuru-Pañcāla country were invited. Yājñavalkya was the leading philosopher at Janaka's court. Difficult metaphysical questions were put to him by eight renowned philosophers of the time—e.g., Uddālaka Āruṇi, "who was a centre of scholars contributing most to the philosophy of Upaniṣads"; Aśvala "the Hotri-priest of king Janaka"; Jāratkārava Ārtabhāga; Bhujyu Lāhyāyani "a fellow-pupil of Āruṇi senior"; Uśasta Cākrāyaṇa; Kahoḍa Kauṣītakeya; Vidagdha Sākalya and Gārgī Vācaknavī. Yājñavalkya defeated them all[6].

1. Sat. Brā. X, 6. 1; Chānd. Up. V, 11.
2. Sat. Brā. XI, 6, 2, 1.
3. Kauṣ. Brā. XXVI, 5.
4. cf. Chānd. Up. IV. 2. 3; VII; Pañc. Brā. XII. 12. 6 ('Rājanya-ṛṣi').
5. IV. 1.
6. Sat. Brā XIV. 6. 1-4; Bṛh. Up. III. 5.

Janaka's offer of his entire kingdom to Yājñavalkya ("Sir, I give you the Videhas and also myself to be together your slaves") for his superb knowledge and intellectual attainments " bears a glowing tribute to the kings, the scholars and the Self-seekers of the time."

The great Maithila philosophers Gautama and Kapila wrote treatises also on medical science. Nimi and his successor Janaka Vaideha are quoted in '*Brahmavaivartta*' as having written treatises on Āyurveda[1]. Unfortunately they are lost and we know them only through some fragments. Cakrapāṇi in his commentary on *Suśruta* mentions Kapila[2]. Gautama is known to us through Mahāmati Vyāsa's commentary on *Nidāna-Grantha* (*yadāha Gotamaḥ*). His *Gavāyurveda-Saṃhitā* (a treatise on veterinary science) is also lost. Suśruta mentions the king of Videha[3] in the beginning of his work, *Uttara-Tantra*.

ART

The practice of art was not encouraged in the age of the Brāhmaṇas. It was held that the vulgar look for their gods in water, men of wider knowledge in celestial bodies, the ignorant in wood, bricks or stones, but the wisest in the Universal Self[4]. The use of icons and the art of sculpture was not much developed during the Brāhmaṇic period.

1. "चकारो जनको योगी वैद्यसंदेहभञ्जनम्"
2. Suśruta. IV. 10.
3. "शालाक्यशास्त्राभिहिता विदेहाधिपकीर्त्तितः"
4. Mulkraj Anand, Hindu View of Art, 63-64.

Art has really no place in the Upaniṣadic scheme of life. It is looked down upon as the source of sensual pleasures[1]. Nevertheless, it was practised to some extent. Iron, copper, linen-robe used in the Rājasūya, stone buildings and bricks etc. are definitely referred to[2]. Images of " fine workmanship " had come to use in worship. Architectural skill is also indicated in the construction of the fire-altar with 10,800 bricks. It was shaped like a large bird with out-spread wings[3]. We have references to the beautiful palaces of varied type of king Janaka. The pre-eminence of Gāndharva, Āyurveda, Dhanurveda and Tantra contributed to the artistic activies of the period—e.g., picture-drawing, construction of tanks, canals, palaces, squares, etc [4]. Huts were built for agriculturist villagers with straw, reeds, bamboos, clay and unburnt bricks. For priestly and aristocratic classes, houses were built of burnt bricks and stones. Forts, castles, palaces, cemetries were built of dressed stones of various kinds[5]. The description of Mithilā given in the Mahājanaka Jātaka[6] speaks of the all-round artistic development of the period. Women were taught some of the fine arts like dancing and singing which were regarded as accomplishments unfit for men[7]. We have

1. Ibid, 73.
2. Coomarswamy, History of Indian & Indonesian Art, 63-64.
3. Vāj Saṃ. XI-XVIII (on Agnilayana).
4. Buch, I, p. 169.
5. Bhandarkar Vol.—Law, 235-37.
6. No. 539.
7. Taitt. Saṃ. VI. 1. 6. 5 ; Maitrā. Saṃ. III. 7. 3 ; Śat. Brā. III. 2. 4. 3.-6 ; AIE, 105.

also reference to a *Rājanya* as a lute-player and singer at the *aśvamedha* sacrifice[1].

RELIGION

In the post-Vedic age the religious convictions of the people were more or less the same as they were in the Vedic age. The only difference was that the major gods were by this time insubordinated to the position of the minor ones and vice-versa. While the popular superstitious beliefs in spirits, imps, spells, incantations and witch-crafts prevailed as before, the sacrificial aspect of the religion developed tremendously. With the efflux of time the Rgvedic monotheistic and monistic tendencies became more and more marked[2]. The Prajāpati-story contains in it the germs of the later doctrines of *avatāras* or divine incarnations. It bears a new spirit of symbolism and spirituality. In the Brāhmaṇa Prajāpati stands for Puruṣa and "the sacrifices are conceived as constantly recurring in order to maintain the universe"[3].

The Upaniṣads also take up the same doctrine and elaborate it. It deals with Brahman or Ātman as the only underlying and ultimate Reality. The Upaniṣads indeed expound a new religion which was opposed to the sacrificial ceremonial. It represents the philosophic aspect of Hinduism. It aims at the achievements of deliverance

1. Sat. Brā XIII. 4. 3. 5 ; also cf. JRAS, 1908, pp. 868-70 ; VI. Vol. I, 206 ; Vol. II, 87.
2. AHI, 50.
3. CHI, I, p. 142 ff.

from mundane existence by the absorption of the individual into Soul (Brahma) by correct knowledge. Ritual is useless for such an aim. Knowledge is all-important : "*tat tvam asi*"—That art thou "that dwelleth in every thing, that guideth all beings within, the inward guide, immortal"[1]. Thus Brahman or Absolute is grasped and definitely expressed for the first time in the history of human thought in the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad[2]. It is these various Upaniṣadic doctrines—along with the doctrines of *Māyā*, *Karma*, *Mukti*, *Transmigration*, etc. interpreted anew in each period—that have dominated Indian thought ever since.

The common people, however, did not understand those abstruse theological and philosophical speculations. They stuck to the worship of the dieties of the Rgvedic period. But these dieties were not so prominent as Indra and Varuṇa[3]. Rudra or Śiva, "the Great God and the Lord of animate beings" ; Viṣṇu "deliverer of mankind in distress" and other gods now came into prominence. This movement was parallel with the development of philosophy. It led to the religions of modern India.

The age is remarkable in as much as it witnessed revolutionary changes. The Brāhmaṇas or the priests went to the extreme in exploiting the religious beliefs and the superstitions of the masses. This culminated in a sort of "intellectual revolt" in Mithilā and other parts of north India. The period intervening the Vedic and the Upani-

1. HC, p. 95 ff.
2. III. 4. 1 ; IV. 5. 1 ; also cf. Macdonell, India's Past, 46.
3. AHI, 50.

ṣadic Ages, i.e., the age of Brāhmaṇa may actually be termed as "the age of sacrificial ceremonials". The society was gradually passing from pure and simple nature of devotion to that of artificialities. The Śatapatha-period was still the "glorious days" of the Aryans. It referred to worship and adore and gave only a subordinate place to rigidness and privations. Devotion of mind was regarded as the predominant factor in their religious life[1]. It was, however, "not without the signs of those competitions that gradually eat up the vitality and sound the death-note of a great race"[2]. The tradition of Rk-composition was practically given a go-by. The meaning (i.e., meditation) of the Vedic *Rcs* and *Mantras* lost all its real significance. The Hindu theory that "religions do not come from without but from within" was ridiculously ignored. It was now a thing beyond their knowledge, beyond their access, beyond their comprehension The priests simply got them by heart and all their meaning—true or false—became exclusively their own property. The result was obvious. These *mantras* in course of time came to be regarded as a thing of magic—known only to the priests or *Yājñikas*. Fast steeped in superstitious and pseudo-religious beliefs, the people acclaimed them as gods on earth (*Bhūdevas*). Numerous intricacies were now introduced in the religious sacrifices. The ceremonies and rituals grew into infinite. Sacrifices were continued for years. Hundreds of priests were engaged for the purpose. The commands of the

1. Sat. Bra. I. 4. 4 1 : "मनश्च ह वै वाक् च भुजौ देवभ्यो यज्ञ वहतः"
2. K. R. Pathak Com. Vol., 21-22.

Bhūdevas must be obeyed, or else they would have to face innumerable divine calamities.

These extreme or rigid forms of religious sacrifices or ceremonies evoked a great spiritual unrest and revolt against "formalism and exclusiveness of the Brāhmaanical system"[1] in the Upaniṣadic period. The expensive sacrifices were denounced as 'irreligious and foolish". The cause of this movement was championed by the intellectual stalwarts like Yājñavalkya Janaka Videha, Ajātaśatru of Kāśī, Pravāhaṇa Jaivali, Aśvapati Kekaya, Uddālaka Āruṇi, Śvetaketu Āruṇeya, Satyakāma Jābāla and Dṛpta Bālāki. Janaka Videha even "refused to submit to the hierarchical pretensions of the Brāhmaṇas and asserted his right of performing sacrifices without the intervention of priests". He finally "succeeded in his contention"[2]. The Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad[3] denounces the upholders of such sacrifices as "fools and fanatics". The Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad[4] goes a step further. It addresses those who work in ignorance as "the draught animals of the Devas" ('Devas' here used in the sense of wise men). The knowledge of Brahman and Ātman was accorded the supreme place by the Upaniṣadic philosophers. The worn-out conventions were kicked off. A new age dawned, a new wave of thought overtook the Upaniṣadic men. This, though not without its drawbacks, heralded a glorious chapter in the history of human thought. Mithilā's contributions to it have been outstanding.

1. Rapson, Ancient India, p. 63.
2. Dowson, 132-33.
3. I, 2. 7.
4. VIII, 10.

PHILOSOPHY

Intermingled with religion is philosophy which is looked upon as the natural outcome of religion. Whether religion leads to philosophy or philosophy to religion, in India the two are inseparable. Upaniṣad or the *Vedānta* philosophy is the "logical outcome of the Sāṃkhya and pushes its conclusions yet further"[1]. Its exponent was Ķapila, "the father of all psychologists"[2]. The ancient system taught by him is still the foundation of all accepted systems of philosophy in India, which are known as *darśanas*. Kapila denies the existence of God as creator. *Prakṛti*, according to him, is sufficient to work out all that is good. The Sāṃkhya system does not believe in the unity of all souls. The Vedānta, however, believes that all individual souls are united in one cosmic being called *Brahman*. Kapila's theory of "the universal extension of matter unbroken" - one substance changing to another substance called *Mahat* 'which in one state manifests as intelligence and in another state as egoism'—is practically 'the stepping stone' to Vedānta. There is thus no philosophy in the world which is not indebted to Kapila[3].

Vedānta means the end of the Veda and as such it recognises its dependence on the Vedas and oneness of religion and philosophy[4]. They are the highest consumma-

1. Vivekanand, Science & Philosophy of Religion, 11.
2. Ibid. 131.
3. Ibid. 46-48.
4. Max Müller. The Vedānta Philosophy, 9-10.

tion of the Brāhmaṇic religion. The name Upaniṣad means etymologically "sitting near a person". They are really the outcome of the "sittings" and the "gatherings" which took place under the shelter of the mighty trees in the forests where old sages and their disciples met together and poured out what they had gathered during days and nights spent in quiet solitude and meditation[1].

The Upaniṣads lay stress on knowledge as the means of Salvation. "*Tarati śokaṃ ātmavit*", i.e., "the knower of Ātman crosses all sorrow"; "*Brahmavid Brahmaiva bhavati*", i.e., "the knower of Brahman, indeed becomes, Brahman".[2] The existence is what Kapila calls *Puruṣa* or *ātman* and the Vedāntist *Self*. The whole universe is one. There is only one Self in the universe, only one Existence. When it is passing through the forms of time, space and causation, it is called Intelligence, self-consciousness, fine matter, gross matter, etc. The whole universe is one, which the *advaitists* call *Brahman*. *Brahman* appearing behind the creation is called God; appearing behind the little universe the microcosm is the Soul. The very Self or *ātman* is, therefore, God in man[3]. The liberated Soul feels his oneness with God so intensely that he calls himself the "creator of the world—I am the food, I am the food-eater, I am the subject, I am the object...... I am the centre of the world, of immortal gods".[4] "There

1. Ibid, 14.
2. cf. Radhakrishnan, Indian Philosophy, I, p. 239; Muṇḍ. Up. II. 2. 2.; Kaṭh. Up. II. 15; etc.
3. Vivekanand, Op. Cit., 89-90.
4. Radhakrishnan, Op. Cit., 239; cf. Taitt. Up. III.

is only one individual existence in the universe, ever free and ever blessed and that is what we are"—this is the last conclusion arrived at by the Advaitists. He, who knows the Self "after having become quiet, subdued, satisfied, patient, and collected sees self in Self, sees all as Self. Evil does not overtake or burn him. Free from evil, free from spots, free from doubts, he becomes a true Brāhmaṇa".

The general spirit underlying the Upaniṣads may be described as the search for truth in life. "Lead me from the unreal to real; lead me from darkness to light; lead me from death to immortality"—prays the sage in the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad[1]. "Whence are we born, where do we live, and whither do we go"? asks the Upaniṣadic poet, and upon reflection he gets the solutions to his queries. He finds that "all we can say about God is negative—it is not this, it is not that". The only possible assertion that the mystic saint makes is when he comes face to face to Him. "That art thou" (*tat tvam asi*)[2]. Ānanda, the Supreme Soul "creates the world and enters it", so that "the world is full of Him", etc. The Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad[3] also makes an important addition to the Doctrine in the form of the gospel of *Karman* ("action") which determines a man's death, the nature of his next.

The doctrine that the Self is yet essentially unknowable through the ordinary avenues of knowledge is as old as the Upaniṣads. The puzzle was first started by Yājña-

1. VIII. 12.
2. For detailed study cf. Radhakrishnan, Op. Cit., p. 170 ff.
3. VI. 2. 14.

valkya, "the great ancient Maithila philosopher of the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad" in his famous dialogues with Maitreyī[1], his wife and Gārgī. The puzzle has remained engrained in the Vedānta philosophy of a later age and has found in Śaṅkara (9th. cent. A. D.) one of its most powerful exponents. In the history of Western thought a strikingly similar doctrine has been the upshot of Kant's critical analysis of knowledge. The nucleus of Yājñavalkya's "Philosophy of Fictions" is explained in the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad[2] where he is telling his wife Maitreyī that "it is only where there is an as-it-were duality"; that "one is able to see another, to know another, to smell another, to hear another, but where to the realiser the whole world is Ātman, by what and what could he perceive, by what and what could he think, by what and what could he hear?"—these are the three steps which the Vedānta philosopher has taken and "we cannot go beyond, because we cannot go beyond unity".

In the history of the great thinkers of the Upaniṣadic period with their distinctive contributions the following names stand out—Mahidāsa Aitreya, Raikva, Śāṇḍilya, Satyakāma Jābāla, Jaivali, Uddālaka, Śvetaketu, Bhāradvāja, Gārgyāyana, Pratardana, Bālāki, Ajātaśatru, Varuṇa, Yājñavalkya, Gārgī, Maitreyī, Janaka Vaideha, Śaibya Satyakāma, Kausalya Āśvalāyana, Bhārgava Vaidarbhi and Kabandhi Kātyāyana[3].

1. Bṛh. Up. IV, 5, 1 (cf. his expounding of Brahmavidyā); also see R. D. Ranade's article in Jha. Com, Vol., 269.
2. II. 4.
3. Radhakrishnan, Op. Cit., 143.

A few words about Yājñavalkya[1], the first reputed author of the white Yajurveda, a prominent authority on the rituals in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa and on philosophy in the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad. He was a native of Mithilā. Regarding his birth place it can safely be asserted that some passages of the *Brāhmaṇas* make it, if not absolutely certain, highly probable that he belonged by descent to the Videhas. This is further confirmed by the fact that his name does not occur in the group of the Kuru-Pañcāla Brāhmaṇas who flocked to Janaka's court[2].

The biography of Yājñavalkya is practically the cultural history of his country in his times[3]. That part of India (Mithilā) was then "the home of Vedic culture" and intellectually most advanced. Firstly he appears as one of a small group of wandering scholars including Śvetaketu Āruṇeya and Śuṣma Sātyayajñin. They met Janaka of Videha and had a discussion on some abstruse rituals. It gave a break in his life. Janaka respected him as his teacher[4]. In the Upaniṣads he figures as the most distinguished philosopher.[5]

1. The word 'Yājñavalkya' means 'one who promulgates sacrifices' (Vide—Pāṇini, IV. 2. 104 : " अव्ययात्त्यप् ") ; also see Triveda, 63.
2. Sat. Brā. XIV. 6. 1. 1.
3. Mookerji, Men and Thought in Ancient India, p. 55 ff.
4. Sat. Brā. X. 6. 2. 1.
5. Deussen, Philosophy of Upaniṣads, 347 ; Yājñavalkya first of all met Janaka Vaideha, along with other wandering scholars from Kuru-Pañcāla country. This shows that he originally hailed from Kuru Pañcāla country. When Janaka respected him as a teacher, he probably settled down in Mithilā and became his most renowned court-poet.

Some scholars believe that he was also the author of the book "Yājñavalkya-Smṛti" (The celebrated code of law) which is only second in importance to that of Manu's. Its well known commentary *Mitākṣarā* is the leading authority of the Mithilā-School. But this is doubtful because Yājñavalkya flourished much earlier than Manu. The Viṣṇu Purāṇa says that as a result of a friction between Vaiśampāyana and (his sister's son) Yājñavalkya Vājasaneya, the latter gave up the teaching of Yajurveda, which he received from his preceptor and uncle. Afterwards he compiled and composed the Śukla Yajurveda, also known as ' Vājasaneyī Saṃhitā"[1].

He lived the philosophy he preached. His theory of the means of self-realisation led him to the crowning act of his life—the renunciation of the world and adoption of mendicant's life. He had two wives[2]—Maitreyī and Kātyāyanī. Maitreyī was conversant with Brahman. Kātyāyanī had the knowledge that ordinary women have. Maitreyī was probably childless. He had a son named Nāciketas[3]. He is called *Yogīśvara*. He appears to be a social reformer of liberal views and his laws are much more humane than those of Manu. He advocated the eating[4] of cows and oxen if it were tender. The signs of his *āsrama* are yet extant. A large banian tree at Jogaban near the Kamataul Station (Darbhanga) on the N. E. Rly. is adored as his hermitage. The Mithilā-tīrtha-prakāśa,

1. Vṣ. III. 5; CAI. 195; Mbh. XII. 360.
2. Sat. Brā XIV. 7. 3. 1.
3. Taitt. Brā III. 11. 8. 14.
4 Sat. Brā. III. 1. 2. 21.

however, places his *āśrama* near Dhanukhā in the village of Kusuma in Nepal[1].

Besides Yājñavalkya, Gautama, Kapila, Vibhāṇḍaka, Satānanda and Ṛṣya Śṛṅga were some of the outstanding Maithila scholars of the time. Ṛṣya Śṛṅga was so renowned that even king Daśaratha invited him in the Kauśikī Valley to perform the sacrifice for a son. He belonged to Kāśyapa school[2]. Vedavatī, the daughter of Kuśadhvaja, was another outstanding scholar of the time[3].

1. Dowson, 337-38; IHQ. 1937, 260-78 ; Triveda, 64.

2. Ṛṣya Śṛṅga also probobly belonged to Jogaban. Dey thinks that Siṃgheśvara in the Madhepur sub-division, partly of Darbhanga district and partly of Bhagalpur district, is the site of his āśrama, ie., at Ṛṣi-Kuṇḍa, 4 miles to the north-west of Bariarpur, a station on E. I. Rly (cf. Dey, 169). The Mahābhārata (Vana parva, 110), however, places his hermitage not far from the river Kauśikī probably at a distance of three yojanas from Campā where the houses of the public women were situated. According to Mithilā-tīrtha-prakāśa his āśrama is said to be in Jogivana near Ahiārī in Jaraila Paragana (Darbhanga). It is called Vibhāṇḍakāśrama. Vibhāṇḍaka Muni was the father of Ṛṣya Śṛṅga. Of the other Ṛṣis whose nativity is claimed by Mithilā, the name of Gautama comes first. His āśrama is said to be at Brahmapura at some distance from Ahiārī. The site of the hermitage of Kapila is known to have been at Kapileśvara in Janakapura. The Bengal District Gazetteer, however, places his āśrama at Kakaraula to the eastern junction of Kamalā and Karaiā, a little to the west of Madhubani where an image of Siva is said to have been installed by the sage. (Vide—Jha Com. Vol., p. 216 ff.).

3. She was a veritable embodiment of Vedic learning. Kuśadhvaja, her father, wished to marry her to Viṣṇu. She, however, refused all her suitors. Sumbha was also one of the suitors. He was killed by Kuśadhvaja. Rāvaṇa in the course of a victorious raid along N. E. India came to her āśrama (Rām. VIII. 17). He was hospitably received by Vedavatī who answered all his inquiries. Being rather indecently accosted she strongly protested against his behaviour. Rāvaṇa, however, attempted violence successfully. Thereupon she mortified herself and died. (Vide—Triveda, 67 ; JBRS. XXXVII, Pts. 3-4, pp. 104-05).

Scholars generally admit that Buddhism was but a natural reaction to the stiff and high philosophy of the Upaniṣads which was quite unintelligible to the ordinary minds. It was as such absolutely cut off from the general mass and became an exclusive property of the few. The result was obvious. Popular discontent grew and began to seek some outlet elsewhere, In the 6th century B.C. the great Buddha, the revolutionary product of this reaction, appeared on the scene as a great healer. The leaders of Hinduism had by now themselves prepared the ground which proved very fertile for the new philosophy—Buddhism to thrive on. This is all the more significant as Buddhism originated in the same region and district to which we have to allot the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, for instance, the country of the Videhas, the Kosalas, the Śākyas. The doctrines promulgated by Yājñavalkya in the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad are in fact completely Buddhistic. The Vedānta philosophy was, for the time being, pushed into oblivion. But the germs were still there, though in a dormant condition. Only a few centuries after, with the rise of the celebrated Śaṅkara, Vācaspati and others, the dormant embryo flowered once again into jiggernot which, despite constant onslaughts from within and without, has through the ages stood rock-like, at least in the tract in which it first germinated, developed and flourished.

CHAPTER III

THE AGE OF THE REPUBLIC

(CIRCA. 600 B. C.—CIRCA. 326 B. C.)

THE VAJJIAN CONFEDERACY

Poltitical evolution in India resembled closely the political evolution in the ancient cities of Greece where also the monarchies of the Heroic Age were succeeded by aristocratic republics[1]. Side by side with the monarchies the republics also existed. One of them was the Confederation of the Licchavis or Vajjian oligarchical republic. The seat of power now shifted from Mithilā to Vaiśālī.

ORIGIN

The Licchavis formed a significant constituent of the Vajjian Confederacy that ruled over the Vajji or Vṛji country. The Vajjis included eight confederate clans (aṭṭhakula) of whom the Videhas, the Licchavis, the Jñātrikas and the Vajjis proper were the most important[2]. Besides these, the Ugras, the Bhogas, the Aikṣvākas and the Kauravas were also associated with the Jñātris and the Licchavis as the members of the same assembly[3].

1. PHAI[6], 121.
2. Ibid, 118,
3. Hoernle, Uvāsagadasāo, II. 138, fn. 304; Aṅguttara Nikāya, I. 26; III. 49; IV, 208; SBE. XLV, 339.

According to Cunningham the Vajjis were divided into several clans such as the Licchavis, the Vaidehīs, the Tīrabhuktis[1] and others whose names are not known. The exact number of those clans composed of one member form each of the separate divisions of the tribe. Yuan Chwang describes them as *San-fa-chih* or Saṃvajji country, i. e., the "United Vajjis,"[2]. Watters believes that the name Vṛji or Vajji or *Varja* arose from the causative *Vṛj* meaning "to shun or avoid"[3]. It appears that the Vajjis and the

1. AGI. (1871 Ed.), 447. Cunningham's reference to Tīrabhukti is doubtful. We come across this name only in the Gup'a and post-Gupta priod. There is no mention of 'Tīrabhukti' in the Jātaka or the Buddhist Pālī literature. Moreover, the Pālī Tripiṭaka and Jātaka were published after the publication of his book in the year 1871. These publications as such were not available to Cunningham. His contention is evidently based on Turnour's article in JASB. VII, p. 993 & note.

2. Tournour's Wajjis (Vide-JASB. VII, p. 982 fn.).

3. II. 81, fn. His theory on the origin of the Vajjis is unconvincing. According to him this name is said to have derived from the advice of the Vaiśālian herdsman to his sons when they were treated roughly by the miraculously born princes whom he had adopted. He advised his sons to avoid them. Hence the name Vajji or Varja (to shun, avoid). For the mythical account of the origin of the Licchavis, cf. Buddhaghosa's Paramatthajotikā on the Khuddaka pātha (Ed. H. Smith), PTS. 158--60.

For different derivations cf. Pāṇini, Uṇādi III, 66 (ऋषति ऋषि गतौ); Amarakoṣa (केशेपि वर्जिन:); Dīpavaṃśa. IX. 1 & etc; Triveda, 31 & 32; Majjhimanikāyaṭīkā, I. 258.

Licchavis were different clans[1]. Vajji was not only the name of the confederacy, it was also one of the constituent clans[2]. The Licchavis and the Videhas were probably conjointly called the Vṛjis or Vajjis. The Thārus even now call the Aryan population of Champaran *Bajis*[3] and the Nepalese address all the non-Nepalese as *Vajiya*[4]. These various interpretations show that the Vṛjis were a large tribe divided into several branches-namely the Licchavis of Vaiśālī, the Vaidehīs of Mithilā and others. Either of these divisions was separately called Vṛjis or any two together were known as Vṛjis or Saṃvṛjis or the united Vṛjis. Vaiśālī thus constituted one of the districts in the territories of the united Vṛjis. This name—Saṃvṛjis or the united Vṛjis-was, therefore, a descriptive title of the whole nation consisting of a confederation of chiefs[5]. It is also suggested that the Vṛjis or Vajjians were a tribe of Videha[6], whose capital was at Mithilā in the 7th. century B. C.[7]. Vaiśāli, the capital of the Licchavis and "the metropolis of the entire confederacy" probably formed a part of the

1. Pāṇini. IV. 2, 131; Arth .398; Yuan Chwang gives separate names for the two countries—Fu-li-chih (Vṛji) and Fei-she-li (Vaiśāli) —Vide Watters, II, 81 & 63; Dictionary of Pāli Proper names II. 782; Law, Kṣatriya Tribes, 21-22 and Pūjāvaliya (Hardy, Manual of Buddhism, 2nd Ed. 242-43).
2. PHAI[6], 119.
3. JBORS. VI. 261.
4. Vidyālaṅkāra, Bhāratiya Itihāsa Kī Rūparekhā, 312.
5. Cunningham, AGI 509ff; JASB. VII 992 fn.
6. Kalpasūtra (SBE. XII Intro.).
7. Cunningham, Op. Cit. (Chap. on Vaiśālī).

territory of the dynasty of Mithilā over which Rāma's brother Bhānumanta ruled [1]. In the times of Bhārata war Vaiśālī formed an independent political entity. After the Bhārata war, howerver, the continued eclipse of Ayodhyā and the revival of Mithilā under Janaka Ugrasena (Ugrasena and at least three Janakas after him, Janadeva, Dharmadhvaja, and Āyasthūna) leaves no doubt that Vaiśālī region became part of the Videhan kingdom [2]. It was after the disestablishment of the Maithila monarchy that the whole region from the Himālaya to the Gaṅgā broke up into a number of aristocratic republics, amongst whom were also the Licchavis or the *Siṃhas* of Vaiśālī. The period between 750 and 650 B. C. witnessed the change to non-monarchical form [3]. In Buddha's time Vaiśālī was a well-established republic, the federal capital of a Republican Confederacy including probably the whole of North Bihar. The Vṛjis or Vajjis and the Licchavis, like the Mallas and others, formerly functioned as two separate republics. When confederated into one, they came to be known as the "Vajjian Confederation". In course of time the Vajjis lost their individuality and the entire Confederation came to be known as the "Licchavi Republic" which included the three districts identified by Hoernle with Vesālī (Vaiśālī) proper, Kuṇḍapura and Vāṇiyagrāma. The remaining clans of the confederacy resided in suburbs and villages like Kuṇḍanagrāma, Kollaga (where Mahāvīra was born), Nadika and Hatthigrāma [4].

1. Homage, 65. 2. Ibid., 61. 3. Ibid , 62
4. D. R. Regmi believes that the Newars existed as early as the 6th Century B. C. and they belonged to the Vṛjji clans (Vide--JBRS. XXXV, p. 30).

In different Indian literature we come across the name of this great tribe in slightly varying forms—*Licchavi*, *Licchivi*, *Lecchavi*, *Lecchai*, *Lichchakhi* and *Nicchivi* (according to Manu[1]). In all the books we get the form Licchavi or Licchivi. Kullūka Bhaṭṭa, the Bengali Commentator, however, reads "*Nicchivi* in the verse of Manu. This reading has been proved untenable by R. D. Banerjee on philological grounds[2]. It has now been proved beyond doubt that the actual form was "*Licchavi*" or "*Licchivi*", and not "*Nicchivi*".

Eariy Indian tradition is unanimous in representing the Licchavis as Kṣatriyas, the Aryan ruling caste. The Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta[3] distinctly refers to the Licchavis of Vaiśālī as Kṣatriyas. It is said that when they heard the news of Buddha's death they claimed a portion of the relics of the Exalted One by virtue of being Kṣatriyas like the Great Buddha. Mahāvīra was also a Jñātri Kṣatriya of the *Kāśyapa gotra*. He is frequently referred to as a "Vaiśālika". Cetaka, the king, of Vaiśālī was his mater-

1. II. 17; also cf. Modern Review, 1919 (July-Dec.), pp 48-56.
2. The Origin of the Bengali Script, 82.
3. VI. 24; Dīghanikāya II. p. 131 (Ed. N. K. Bhagavat)—' भगवपि खत्तियो अहमपि खत्तियो" ; also cf. Sumaṅgala Vilāsinī, I. 312 (PTS); The Sugala Jātaka (Fausboll, II, p. 5); SBE. XXII. pp.xii, 227; Rockhill, The Life of Buddha (1907 Ed.), p. 203, fn.; Divyāvadāna (Ed. Cowell & Neil), 55-6, 136; Mahāvastu (Ed. Senart), I, 254. etc; Jaina Sūtras, SBE. XXII, 266, fn. 1; XIV, Pt. ii, 321, fn. 3; Law, Tribes in Ancient India, pp. 294-98 with footnotes.

nal uncle[1]. They probably belonged to the *Vaśiṣṭha gotra*, for the Buddha always addressed them as Vaśiṣṭhas or "men of Vaśiṣṭha race"[2]. The Nepal Vaṃśāvalis also present them as belonging to the Solar race or *sūrya-vaṃśa*[3]. This further supports their Vaśiṣṭha-gotra. The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa[4] declares that the *gotra* or *pravara* of a Kṣatriya is the same as that of his *purohita* or family-priest who makes him perform the sacrifices.

Manu, however, brands the Licchavis, like the Videhas, as Vrātyas. But, from his statement it is clear that he concurs in the view that they were *Rājanyas* or Kṣatriyas[5].

1. SBE. XII. pp. xii, 227, 266 fn. 255-56; Kalpasūtra, x-xii; Jaina Sūtras II (SBE. XLV, 321).
2. Mahāvastu, I. 283; SBE. XXII, p, *x*ii, 193 (Ayāraṅga Sūtra, II.15. 15); Rockhill, Life of Buddha, 97 ff; Law. Tribes in Ancient India, 298.
3. IA. XXXVII, 79.
4. 34, 7, 25; R. G. Bhandarkar, Vaiṣṇavism, Saivism and minor Religious Systems, p. 12; also cf. Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta (Buddhist Suttas. SBE. XI. 121-22) and the Saṅgīti Sutta of the Dīghanikāya (Dialogues, III. 202) where the kinship of Licchavis and Mallas is confirmed and the Mallas are likewise addressed as 'Vāseṭṭhas' (Vāśiṣṭhas). For Licchavis' association with Sākyas cf. Karma-Sataka (trans. M. L. Feer), 20, ii, 7; Rockhill. p. 203, note.
5. Manu. X. 22 :

   "झल्लो मल्लश्च राजन्याद्व्रात्यान्लिच्छिविरेव च
   नटश्च करणश्चैव खसो द्रविड़ एव च"

   ('From a Vrātya of the Kṣatriya caste sprang the Jhalla, the Malla, the Licchavis, the Naṭa etc."); Also cf. X. 20; Būhler, Laws of Manu, 405-06 & n. 20; Here Manu is in agreement with the earlier law-givers—Gautama (XXI 11.), Apastamba (I. 1. etc), Vaśiṣṭha (XI. 74-9) and Baudhāyana (I. 16. 16.); See also Haraprasad Sāstrī's Annual Address (JASB, XVII, No. 2, N. S.) ; Aśvaghosa, Buddha-Carita, XXI, 15-16; XXII. 15 etc.

By "Vrātya" Manu means "those (sons) whom the twice-born beget on wives of equal caste, but who, not fulfilling their sacred duties, are excluded from the Sāvitrī". The Licchavis were no doubt indigenous Kṣatrīyas, but when they championed the cause of non-Brāhmaṇical faith and joined the ' re-actionary movement (Buddhism and Jainism) against Brahmanism, they fell off from the strict observance of Brahmanic regulations in the eyes of the exponents of Brahmanism. As a result they were dubbed Vrātyas by Manu and his followers"[1].

Two theories referring to the Tibetan and Persian affinities of the Licchavis were advanced by the late V. A. Smith and Satis Chandra Vidyābhūṣaṇa respectively. Smith's reference to the "custom of the exposure of dead" is unwarranted, for this custom was also in practice among the Vedic Aryans[2] from whom the Licchavis were descended. As regards the ancient judicial procedure at Vaiśālī given in the Aṭṭhakathā and prevalent even in modern times at Lhasa, it may be said that the Tibetans imbibed this custom along with Buddhism from Tīrabhukti or Mithilā which was nearest to their frontiers and was inhabited by the descendants of the Licchavis of the old[3]. The kings of Tibet and Ladak trace their descent from the Licchavis.

1. JASB. 1933, p. 233.
2. Av. XVIII. 2. 34 : "ये निखाता ये परोप्ता ये दग्धा ये चोद्धिता: सर्वास्तानग्न आवह पितॄन हविषे अत्तवे"; cf. Atharvaveda Saṃhitā (Roth & Whitney) p. 339; Atharva Saṃhitā (Whitney & Lanman), Harvard Oriental Series, VIII, p. 840-41; Apastamba. I. 87; IA. XXXII, 234 etc; Law, Tribes in Ancient India, 302-03.
3. Law, Op. Cit, 303.

They were probably the offshoots from the Nepal branch of the Licchavis.

Vidyābhūṣaṇa's theory[1] that the Licchavis came into India from Nisibis is evidently based on Manu. We have, shown that Manu's Nicchivi is a corrupted form of Licchavi.

Interpreting a very fine temple seal[2] discovered in the excavations carried at Basārh (the site for Vaiśālī) Spooner observes that the two closely horizontal lines divide the field into two unequal parts. the larger half being above the line and occupied by the device "which is a perfect example of the Persian Fire-altar-motif and is an eloquent witness for and the direct confirmation of Vidyābhūṣaṇa's theory of Persian origin of the Licchavis". In his opinion the legends *bhagavata ādityasya*—' of the blessed Sun"—*ādityasya* (of the Sun), *Ravidāsaḥ* (the Slave of the Sun), etc.–confirm the Persian character of the device and point to the pronouncedly Persian cult of the Sun in eastern India in Gupta times[3]. The theory is untenable. The fire-cult already existed in the Rgvedic times among the Indo-Aryans. "Though the existence of Image-worship is a matter of controversy, it is, nonetheless, certain that there are references to symbols or sensible representations of gods like Agni, Indra, Sūrya, etc"[4]. Besides, the Vedic fire-cult was already established in North Bihar which also included Vaiśālī and Videha[5]. Till the Gupta Age, Persians, Śakas, Hūṇas and other races had infiltrated into India and mingled with the people here. Naturally there was an

1. JASB. 1902, pp. 142-48; IA. XXXVII. 79.
2. Arch. Surv. Ind. Ann. Rep. 1913-14, Pl. XLIX, No 607.
3. Ibid, 120-21.
4. Banerjea, Development of Hindu Iconography, 47-48.
5. JRASB. XVI, Pt. II, 179.

intermingling of their views, manners, practices and customs among the various peoples inhabiting the land. This so-called device might have been the result of this mutual influence. This does not, however, mean that it was of the Persian origin. It is interesting to note that the Ṛgvedic Aryans were associated with the cult of Agni, the Fire-God —a diety conspicuous by its absence in the Boghaz Keui records of the 4th century B.C. and of whose worship no traces are found in the Mohenjodāro[1]. Moreover. Aelian in his account of the pomp and grandeur of the palace of Candragupta Maurya records that "only the well-known vanity of the Persians could prompt such a comparison". If this were the case in the 4th. century B C.. it is absurd to trace Persian influence two centuries earlier[2].

S. Beal's theory[3] that the people of Vaiśālī were a northern people allied to Yue-Chi (for, the symbols used by the Chinese and for the Vṛjjis are the same) is absolutely unfounded as we know that the Yue-Chi came to India about the beginning of the Christian era and the Licchavis flourished as a highly civilised and prosperous people in the 5th and 6th centuries before Christ[4].

VAIŚĀLĪ

The history of Vaiśālī goes back to hoary antiquity. We have a glimpse of Vaiśālī as a splendid city which they

1. AHI. 27.
2. cf. Homage, 73-74; JRASB. XVI. Pt. II. 169-80; Law, Kṣatriya Tribes, 26-30.
3. The life of Hiuen-Tsiang, Int. xxii.
4. Law, Tribes in Ancient India, 304; for a detailed discussion see HP.[2], 181-84.

probably occupied after subduing the original inhabitants of the place as the name *Vijita Deśa* (conquered place) indicates. The first mention of Vaiśālī in ancient historical tradition occurs in the Purāṇas which speak of Manu's family–the first Manu and his son Priyavrata. They flourished about seven or eight generations before the Ailas and Ikṣvākus started their respective famous dynasties with their main branches at Pratiṣṭhāna or Prayāga and at Ayodhyā about ninety generations before the Bhārata war (about twenty-third century B. C.) towards the conclusion of the so-called "Mohenjo-daro" or pre-Aryan (pre-Aila) civilisation (c. 3750 to 2000 B. C.[1]). The legends of Uttānapāda and his wife Bahulā; Ṛṣabha and his son Bhārata; a very ancient struggle of Śaiva-Vaiṣṇava character between the worshippers of Aja-Ekapāda (Rudra in elephant form) and of Kūrma (tortoise-incarnation of Viṣṇu) and king Ariṣṭa's son Nābha or Nābhāga ("Nediṣṭa" of the Ikṣvākus of the middle Himālayan region) are also connected with Vaiśālī in very ancient times. With Karandhama (his earlier proper names being Suvarcas, Balāśva, Balākāśva, and Suvalāśva) of this family begins a fresh powerful Vaiśāleya dynasty, an imperial wide ruling, which left its stamp on the general history of ancient India[2].

The Epics[3] and the Purāṇas[4] also state that Viśālā was at first ruled by kings. The founder of this Vaiśālika dynasty

1. Homage, 45.
2. Ibid. 46-49.
3. Rām. I. 45. 9-11; I. 47. 11-17; Mbh. VII. 55; XII. 20; XIV. 4. 65--86.
4. Vā. 86. 3-12; Vṣ. IV. 1. 15-19; Gar. I. 138. 5-13; Bhāg. IX. 2. 23-36; Lg. I. 66; Bd. III. 61. 3-18; Mārk. 109-36.

was Viśāla, a son of Ikṣvāku and the heavenly nymph Alambuṣā. It was after his name that the city came to be known as Viśālā[1]. The Purāṇas state that this Viśāla was succeeded by Hemacandra, Sucandra. Dhūmrāśva, Śṛñjaya Sahadeva, Kuśāśva, Somadatta, Kākustha, and Sumati. The Viṣṇu Purāṇa[2] says that Tṛṇabindu was descended from Ikṣvāku. He had by Alambuṣā a son, Viśāla who founded the city of Vaiśālī[3]. Tenth in descent from Viśāla was king Sumati who figures as a host of Rāmacandra. He was, therefore, a contemporary of king Daśaratha of Ayodhyā. None of these Purāṇas, however, carries the genealogy beyond Pramati or Sumati. Only four lists are complete, those in the Vāyu, Viṣṇu Garuḍa and Bhāgavata. The Rāmāyaṇa begins the dynasty with Viśāla and wrongly calls him son of Ikṣvāku[4]. These sources, however, do not agree over the historical traditions they present. It cannot however, be doubted that its history dates back to a very ancient period.

1. "इक्ष्वाकुस्तु नरव्याघ्र: पुत्र. परमधार्मिक:, अलम्बुषायामुत्पन्नो विशाल इति विश्रुत:, तेन चासीदिहस्थाने विशालेति पुरी कृता"

2. IV. 1-18; also cf. Gḍ. 1· 138. II; Bhāg IX 2. 31.

3. Vā. 86. 15-17; Bd. III. 61. 12; Vṣ. IV. 1. 18; Rām. 1. 47. 12; Bhāg. IX, 2, 33.

4. AIHT. 96-97. For the list of the names of the kings of pre-Buddhist Vaiśālī, cf. Homage, pp. 49-58, 96; Vā. 86. 3 -12; 99. 3-4; Vṣ. IV. 1. 15-19; IV. 16. 2; Gar. 1. 138, 5-13; Bhāg. IX. 2. 23-36; Bd. III 61. 3-18; III. 74. 3-4; Hv. 1832-4; CHI. I. 157ff; Triveda, 18-28 & etc.

After the great Bhārata War, of Mānava Kingdom there remained only three-those of Ayodhyā, Videha and Vaiśālī[1]. We have no information about these kingdoms in the succeeding period. It is after several centuries that in the 6th and 7th centuries B.C. in the times of Buddha and Mahāvira we get a clear and complete picture of the great Vajjian Confederacy.

In Buddha's time Vaiśālī was a populous and prosperous town. It was at the height of its prosperity with its three districts containing houses numbering 7000, 14000, and 21000 respectively[2]. The Gilgit MSS[3]. also record that Vaiśālī was at that time divided into three quarters, having 7000, 14000, and 21000 turrets (Kūṭāgāra) with gold, silver and copper pinnacles (*niryūha*). They were inhabited by the high, middle and low classes[4] respectively. Mahāvastu[5] says that the citizens of Vaiśālī were distinguished as *Abhyantara-Vaiśālikas* (the cockneys of the city) and *Bahira-Vaiśālikas* (the citizens of Greater Vaiśālī, outside the metropolis). Their total number was twice "84000". i. e., 1.68,000. Mahāvagga[6] describes Vaiśālī as "an opulent, prosperous, and populous town with 7707 storeyed buildings, 7707 pinnacled buildings, 7707 Aramas and 7707

1. AIHT. 292.
2. Tibetan Dulva, iii. f. 80 ; Uvāsagadasāo. II. 4. fn. 8; pp. 5-6; Sinclair Stevenson, The Heart of Jainism, 21-22.
3. Vol. III. Pt. II.
4. B. C. Law Val. Pt. I. p. 134; Tibetan Dulva, iii. f. 80; Rockhill, Life of the Buddha, 62; Uvāsagadasāo II, p. 6.
5. Vol. I. pp. 295-9.
6. Vinaya Texts, Pt. II., (SBE). 171.

lotus-ponds, with its *Rājās* or Chiefs numbering 7707. Each of these chiefs decorated the capital with a variety of structures, houses, palaces, *caityas* and *vihāras*. The famous *caityas* were (i) *Udena* to the east of Vaiśālī, (ii) *Gotamaka* to the south, (iii) *Saptāmraka* (Sattamba) to the west, (iv) *Bahuputra* on the north, (v) *Cāpāla*, (vi) *Kapinahya*, (vii) *Sārandada* and (viii) *Markaṭahrada*. These shrines were given to the Buddha as gift[1]. According to Lalitavistāra[2], Vaiśālī abounded in buildings of every description (storeyed mansions, towers, palaces, etc.)· It resembled "the city of gods" and Buddha called the Lcchavis the '*trayastriṃśat devas*". The Tibetan Dulva describes it as a kind of "earthly paradise".

These descriptions in the Buddhist and Jaina texts, however, seem much exaggerated. If genuine they bear no parallel in the history of the world and fall beyond human imagination. It would also be quite unfair if we assume that the descriptions given in these texts are in entirety imaginary or fictitious. Vaiśālī was undoubtedly a magnificent city but not so as these descriptions would suggest.

The identification of Vaiśālī till recent times had been a matter of great controversy. A sort of myths had evolved round its exact location. General Cunningham, with his immense knowledge of the country, came to the fore; exploded the so-called mist of confusion and boldly pointed to the ruins at and near Basarh in the Muzaffarpur

1. Vinaya Texts, SBE. Pt. III., 408ff. Also see Homage, 4-5; 24-25; Dialogues of the Buddha, Pt. III. p. 14; Divyāvadāna, p. 201.
2. Ed Lefman, chap. III. p. 21.

district in Tirhut as the remains of Vaiśālī[1]. M. Viven de St. Martin readily agreed to this suggestion. But the assertion in favour of the current belief by Cunningham lacked fulness, clearness and adequate evidences. It was, therefore, impossible for his readers to feel assured of the identity of Vaiśālī with Basārh. The result was, most of the scholars dissented from his conclusions[2].

The identity was finally proved decisively by the archaeological excavations carried by T. Bloch on the site in 1903-04[3]. He excavated a mound called *Rājā Viśāl kā Garh*. Most of the clay-seals bear the names of *Tīrabhukti* and *Vaiśālī* itself *(Vesāliye anusaṃyānakaṭakāre..)*. The excavations of 1913–14 carried by Spooner on the same site 'have provided us with several additional reasons for believing that the capital of the Licchavis was really here". Bloch's result had taken us back with certainty to the Gupta period with suggestions of earlier occupations. "The present excavations clearly established the occupation of the site for Kuśāna, the Śuṅga, or even the Maurya Age". It took back *Rājā Viśāl Kā Garh* from the fourth century A.D. to the third century B. C. There is now every reason to assume that an even higher antiquity can be established for the site when a more extensive examination of the lower strata is made possible[4].

1. Arch. Surv. Rep. Vol. I. 55-56; Vol. XVI. 6.
2. Rhys Davids, Buddhist India, 41 ; JASB. 1900, Pt. I. pp. 78, 83 ; JRAS. 1902 p, 267, n. 3 ; Encyclopaedia of Religion & Ethics XII (New York, 1971), pp 567-68.
3. Arch. Surv. Ind. Ann. Rep. 1903-04, p. 74 ff.
4. Ibid. 1913-14 (Excavations at Basarh), Pls. XLIII, XLIV, XLV.

POLITY

The republics that flourished in the days of the Buddha covered the area between Gorakhapur and Darbhanga and the Himālaya and the Gaṅgā[1]. Jayaswal puts it as "the lands to the east of kingdom of Kosala and Kausāmbī, and the west of Aṅga, from the districts of Gorakhapur and Balliā to the distrct of Bhagalpur, to the north of Magadha and the south of the Himālaya[2]. The republics were those of the Bhaggas, the Kulis, the Koliyas, the Śākyas, the Licchavis and the Videhas. The Licchavi state was the biggest in area, though it was probably not more than 5000 sq. miles[3].

The change of administrative set up from monarchy to republic is, by some scholars, attributed to initiative and efforts of the younger princes of Royal family. It was the elder sons who exercised the rights and royal privileges. The younger ones had no chance to reign. This jealousy and selfishness may have proved a great factor in shattering the age-old fetters of monarchy[4]. The Purāṇic traditions record that the monarchial form of government continued to prevail at Vaiśālī for about 13 generations after king Viśāla. The dynastic lists of other houses are continued in Purāṇas down to the beginning of the Bhārata war, but no mention is made of the successors of Pramati (the last king of Vaiśālī) who flourished about 30 generations before the Bhārata war. This silence, according to

1. Homage, 69 ; AMV. Pt. I., 247-49.
2. HP (1st. Ed.), 48.
3. Homage, 69-70 ; 68-69.
4. Ibid, 101.

some scholars, was due to the establishment of a republic there. The date of the Bhārata War being c. 1450 B. C., the establishment of Vaiśālī republic probably took place about 30 generations or 450 years before this event, that is c. 1950 B. C. Some scholars believe that this change occurred in the period intervening Rāma who accepted the hospitality of king Sumati of Vaiśālī and the Bhārata War[1]. We have already shown in the preceding pages the unconvincing nature of this suggestion. Vaiśālī, however, emerges into history as a large and flourishing republic only in the time of Buddha and Mahāvīra.

Vaiśālī was a city state, like the states in ancient Greece. It was not a full-fledged republican state. It was oligarchy as the franchise was limited to the members of the Confederate clans, i.e., seven thousand, seven hundred and seven rājās only. The term was used by the ancients probably to denote a state composed of a group or college of persons like Sparta, Athens, Carthage, Rome and Venice[2]. It may be called a republic in the sense that the power was vested in numerous clans of persons—not necessarily based on adult franchise. The ancient republics, mostly tribal and generally oligarchic, had often sprung from more ancient monarchies—for example, the Vajjian Confederacy in what was once the kingdom of the Videhas. They functioned in the same manner as did the oligarchic republics in Europe, e. g.—the Bacchiards of Corinth. The royal power was in commission and was owned jointly by all the nobles[3].

1. Ibid, 110.
2. Homage, 68.
3. AMV., Pt. I. 167 ff.

The Vaiśālī state clans appear to have been divided into 7707 Kṣatriya families known as Rājans. There was a like number of Viceroys, Generals, Treasurers, Yuvarājas or heir-apparents. They permanently resided and ruled there. It was like a federation of 7707 kings[1]. They maintained their separate autonomy. The Saṃgha was, however, allowed to exercise supreme power with reference to other matters affecting the State. Majumdar thinks that while the number seven thousand, seven hundred and seven may be dismissed as a purely conventional one, it may be accepted as "the Supreme Assembly consisting of a pretty large number of members and must as such be held to be a popular one".[2] It appears that these so-called 7707 Rājans were like 7707 Zamindārs owning small militia of their own. The Assembly consisted of them and they participated in its deliberations at their will. It was thus a kind of Government of 7707 kings, for 7707 kings and by 7707 kings. These kings were the ruling class and the executive office-holders though the total population was much larger, divided in outer and inner citizens[3].

Every one of these seven thousand and odd rājās had theoretically the same rights and priviledges. In actual practice, however, the voice of the Elders prevailed. The real power was perhaps exercised by selected respectable members of the Assembly whose proposals were usually

1. Bhandarkar, Car. Lect. 155.
2. Corporate Life (1st. Ed.), 92-93 ; IHQ. XX. 344 ff.
3. HP. (1st. Ed.), 51—52 ; Majumdar thinks (Op. Cit , 94) that it is possible that the local government was a concern of all the castes and might have enjoyed perfect democracy.

assented to by others. Hoernle thinks that the government of Vaiśālī was vested in a senate composed of the heads of the resident Kṣatriya clans. It was presided over by an officer who had the title of king. He was assisted by a Viceroy and a Commander-in-Chief[1]. It thus resembled the city-state of Athens, where too a Central Assembly consisted of the representatives of the smallest local units—the *demes* which managed the local affairs[2].

The Licchavis formed a Saṃgha or Gaṇa where "what was desired by ten was opposed by twenty"[3]. The best known form is Gaṇa "which was tribal in character and confined to the Kṣatriya order"[4]. Kauṭilya says that these saṃghas or corporations—e.g. the Licchavis, the Vṛjjis, the Mallas, the Madras, the Kukuras, the Kurus, the Pañcālas and others lived by the title of Rājās (*Rājaśabdopajīvinaḥ*)[5]. The expression is controversial. The word "Rājā", however, seems to be a synonym for Kṣatriya. It was used even by the Āndhras to designate a Kṣatriya[6]. It is probable that the word "Rājā" in early times designated a Kṣatriya but later came to mean a king.

ADMINISTRATION.

The Aṭṭhakaṭhā[7] mentions three highest officers—the

1. JASB. 1898, p. 40.
2. Corporate Life (1st. Ed.)., 94.
3. B. C. Law Vol. Pt. I, 140.
4. Car. Lect., 142 ff.
5. Chap. XI. 376-79 ; Lalitavistara (Ed. Lefman) I. p. 21 ; HP2 52 ff ; Car. Lect. 145 ff ; Law, Kṣatriya Tribes, 91.
6. Savarasvāmī, Commentary on Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā Sūtra, Bk. II ; also cf. Amarakoṣa, II. 8, 9, 3.
7. The Aṭṭhakthā on the Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta (cf. Sumaṅgalavilāsinī II, 519, (PTS.).

President (*Rājā*). the Vice-President (*Upa-Rājā*), and the Generalissimo (*Senāpati*). An early authority[1] adds one more to this list, i. e., the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Bhaṇḍāgārika). There is no doubt that these were the four highest administrative officers and that they composed the Cabinet or Executive authority[2]. The 7707 rājās or kings became the President, the Vice--Presidents the Commanders-in-Chief or Chancellors of Exchequer in turn. It was this group that shaped the destiny of the entire population.

The executive functions probably vested in the smaller body of eight (Aṣṭakula) or nine. The Kalpasūtra[3] also speaks of nine. They adopted uniforms of different colours. The President was the highest judicial authority. There was a judicial minister who could be even an outsider, a paid officer. The Council of Nine was in-charge of foreign affairs. It was one of the important functions of General Assembly to elect the Executive of the State. This consisted of about 8 to 10 persons. Each member must have been in charge of the departments of the state like the Military, Finance, Revenue, Foreign Affairs & etc. We do not know if the Licchavis discussed the foreign affairs in General Assembly. The Gilgit MSS[4]. however, say that even in minute details the Executive authorities were controlled by the Assembly. This is more or less apparent from the change in the tone of official dispatches brought about by Khaṇḍa's taking part in the deliberations

1. Ekapaṇṇa J. N. 149 ; also see Cullakāliṅga J. No. 301.
2. cf. HP². 47 ; Law, Tribes in Ancient India, p. 322 ff.
3. Jaina Sūtras, Pt. I, SBE XXII, 266.
4. Vol. III., Pt. II.

of the Assembly. It would also appear that Senāpati was the head of the State[1]. The official dispatches of Vaiśālī commenced with the words—"thus commands the Gaṇa with Khaṇḍa as their head" (*"Khaṇḍa pramukha gaṇa"*). Siṃha was elected to the post by the Assembly and so must have been Khaṇḍa, his father.

There was also a Council of Eight of Justice. The Aṭṭhakula formed the superior court of Justice, i. e., the Council of Final Appeal[2]. Certain procedures were adopted before a criminal was sent to the court.—(i) the *Viniścaya Mahāmātras* ascertained the facts of the case; (ii) the *Vyavahārikas* (lawyers), and (iii) *Sūtradhāras* kept up the thread of law and custom and explained their spirit behind their changing forms. Any of these successive courts could also pronounce a citizen innocent and acquit him[3]. Even if held guilty by all these courts, ths matter was subject to the final decision of the members of the Executive Cabinet. The prevailing Penal Code was known as *Paveni Potthaka*[4]. Moreover, no marriage could be negotiated outside Vaiśālī, or even outside its districts without the permission of the Licchavi Gaṇa. Very often the Gaṇa itself selected a bride[5].

They also observed the procedure of the quorum. A Saṃgha lacking quorum is described as incomplete[6]. A

1. B. C. Law Vol. Pt. I, p. 40.
2. HP², 49-50.
3. JASB. VII, 993-94.
4. cf. HP. (1st, Ed.), 50.
5. Vinaya Texts, IV. 225 ; B. C. Law Vol., Pt. I., 134-35.
6. Mahāvagga IX. 4. 2; V. 13, 12; I. 31, 2; IX. 4, 1 ; VIII. 24, 7.

full assembly of qualified members is sometimes called as *Sammukha.* An invalid Act could be impugned by another assembly[1]. An Act of an assembly inadequately constituted could be indemnified by a fuller Assembly. There was also a Whip[2]. There were certain rules to govern the business of the house[3]. Debates were held whenever a resolution was considered. Very often quarrels, violence, dispute also broke out[4]. They, however, always aimed at achieving unanimity of decision.

There was a Committee of Reference. It was appointed to negotiate a difference. It was governed "by means of a referendum" technically called *Ubhāhikāya*[5]. The Principle of Represntation was also applied to the appointment of members to the Jury or Commission. Proceeding in Presence was applied to cases when decision was reached by agreement among members. All the resourees of amicable settlement having failed, the case was taken up to the whole Saṃgha. It then settled it by "Vote of Majority"[6]. A Polling Officer was appointed by the Saṃgha who must be free from partiality, (*chand*), malice (*doṣa*), folly (*moha*) and fear (*bhaya*)[7]. *Nāyaka* or the Chief Magistrate was clected by the ruling class of the Assembly for carrying out its decisions[8]. Voting was

1. SBE. XX. 37.
2. Mahāvagga, III. 6, 6.
3. Ibid. IX. 3. 1-2.
4. Ibid XII. 2, 7.
5. Ibid. XIII. 2. 8.
6. Irid. IV. 8, 9.
7. Ibid. IV. 14, 26.
8. Rockhill, Life of Buddha, 62.

free and by tickets (*śalākā*) made of slips of woods. The Polling Officer was known as "*śalākāgrāhapaka*"[1].

It appears from Cullavagga[2] that a member was liable to the "Procedure of Censure" if he did not control himself in discussion. Re-opening a settled question was an offence[3]. They also maintained a Police-Department. They were notorious for bribery and excess of injustice[4]. The public hall, where the political and religious meetings took place, was known as Saṃthāgāra. There was an officer, "The Regulator of Seats" (*āsapaṇṇāpaka*). His function was to seat the members present in their proper places.

The most important aspect of the Vajjian confederacy was the "Federal Council". Apart from the two Vajji republics—the Videhas and the Licchavis—this Council was composed of 18 members—nine Licchavis and nine Mallikas. The members of this Council were designated as "Gaṇa-Rājās". It was probably to a Federal Council of this class to which the technical term "Rājaka" of Amarasiṃha originally applied[5]. The Jaina Kalpa Sūtra refers to "the formation of a confederacy, along with the nine Licchavis and nine Mallikas with the eighteen Gaṇa-Rājās

1. Vinayapiṭaka, II, 315 ; Mahāgovinda Suttanta of the Dīgha-Nikāya, XX. 14 ; JASB. 1938, p. 993 fn ; HP. (1st. Ed.), 112.
2. IV. 14, 9.
3. cf. HP[2], 47 ff.
4. Upādhyāya, Prācīna Bhārata kā Itihāsa, 99.
5. HP (1st Ed.), 53.

of Kāśī-Kosala[1]. Cetaka was an important leader. He was a Videhan, domiciled at Vaiśālī. His sister was Triśalā or Videhadattā, the mother of Mahāvīra, and his daughter was Cellanā or Videhī, the mother of Kuṇika Ajātaśatru.

In the beginning these chiefs of the clans were independent of one another. But a time came when the instincts of self-preservation and safety impelled the various petty chiefs to form themselves into a Saṃgha or Confederacy or else they would be swept off their feet before the rising Magadhan power. This confederated Saṃgha was known as the Vajjian Confederacy of which the Federal Council was the Supreme Head. All these federal states had equal votes based on terms of equality. "The constitution of this Licchavi Saṃgha can be compared to the confederation of the German States called the German Empire".[2] Kauṭilya says that these Saṃghas were unconquerable because of their unity.

SOCIETY

We find a marked change in the social status of the people during the period. The rigidness and complexities that characterised the Brāhmaṇic and Upaniṣadic ages were now slackened, though social distinctions in some form or other existed. The picture of the society portrayed

1. "नव मल्लई (मल्लती) नव लेच्छई (लेच्छती) कासी कोसलगा (कोसलका) अट्ठारस वि गणरायानो"—Kalpasūtra of Bhadrababu, Ed. Jacobi, 1879, Jinacarita, p. 65 ; Nirayāvaliyā Suttam (S. Warren), 1879 ;SBE, XXII, 1884, p. 266. For Dr. Barua's views see IC. II. p. 810; PHAI[6], pp. 125. 128, 26.
2. Car. Lect. 142 ff.

in the Jātakas is in many respects similar to that found in the Purāṇas. A study of the Jātakas creates the impression that the priestly caste had lost its authority. Nobles and wealthy merchants were more respected than the Brāhmaṇas[1]. The people did not care much for the Brāhmaṇical rules of castes and āśramas. The Brāhmaṇa often followed professions against the prescriptions of law-books. Occupational castes were no longer in existence. One could adopt any profession one liked to. A Brāhmaṇa lived as an archer, a carpenter, a caravan-guard, a snake-charmer, agriculturist, hunter and carriage-driver without incurring social stigma[2]. He also mastered astrology, palmistry, magic and other arts to earn his livelihood. He was also employed as state-official and was often found guilty of misconduct in money-matters[3].

Similarly a Kṣatriya or a Vaiśya could take up any profession he wished to. Brāhmaṇas often ate with Kṣatriyas and Cāṇḍālas[4], for which they were deprived, by their brother Brāhmaṇas, of their status as Brāhmaṇa. A Kṣatriya would not eat with his own daughter[5]. These contradictory statements do not reflect a stable society but a stage facing divergent social forces—rather a constant struggle between the attracting and repelling trends. Despite all the

1. CHI. I, 221.
2. cf. Culladhanuggaha J. No. 374 ; Phandan J. No. 475 ; Brahmajāla Sutta (Dialogues of the Buddha, 16, 67-70).
3. Phandana J. No. 475.
4. Dialogues of the Buddha, 120 : also cf. Buddhist India, Chap. IV.
5. cf. Mataṅga J. No. 497.

reverses the ancient Brāhmaṇic forces and traditions were still at work. The first wave of Buddhism touched only that part of the country where it first germinated and flourished. The earlier writings represent chiefly the circumscribed areas where Brāhmaṇism was weakest. The stronghold of Brāhmaṇism lay to the west, and there the priest exercised his power among clans boasting direct descent from the Vedic heroes. As a result a portion of the Vajjian Confederation, i.e., the Videhan territory was yet less influenced by the rising orders.

The "four colours" adopted by the Licchavis probably show that they were divided into separate sects, as the "Lords and Commons", "Upper, Middle, Lower classes."[1] The Gilgit MSS. and the Tibetan Dulva clearly mention the division of the capital city of Vaiśālī into three residential quarters based on wealth. The restrictions on marriage between equals in each quarter certainly speak of the existence of class distinctions and the idea of the preservation of purity of blood of a fairly rigid type. Moreover, division of a capital city on the basis of wealth is a thing unheard of. Slackening in social rules in the case of Khaṇḍa, the Commander-in-Chief and Āmrapālī, the noted courtesan, does not point to the general flexibility of the social rules. They were honoured because of their privileged position as Commander-in-Chief and as an object of beauty and decoration of Vaiśālī respectively.

The Cāṇḍālas are frequently referred to. They were despised by the nobler sections of the society. A Brāhmaṇa did not dine with a Cāṇḍāla[2]. They were

1. CHI, I. 209.
2. Satadhamma J. No. 179.

slaves first and last. They lived outside the divisions of the capital city. Of all the people they were the most hated creatures who, like their counterparts in the Brāhmanic and Upaniṣadic ages, were dumb and lifeless. This down-trodden fraction of humanity could never rise its head even though the Great Buddha and Mahāvīra had come and gone.

Employment of slaves appears to be a common practice. They were mostly employed as house-hold servants. They were regarded as the property of their masters. The Jātaka[1] speaks of manumitted slaves. Children born of slave parents generally took up the same profession. The male and female-slaves lived in the house of their masters and performed all house-hold duties[2]. The Buddha in the Sāmaññapha Sutta describes the position of a slave as "a server rising up earlier, sleeping later, always waiting for the bidding, working to please, speaking to flatter and looking to another person for favour."[3] The Vidhurapaṇḍita Jātaka[4] speaks of four kinds of slaves: those by birth (*āmāya*), those by purchase (*dhanena kītā*), those by choice (*sayaṃ upayanti*) and those by fear

1. Suruci J. No. 489 ; Visayha J. No. 340
2. Kulāvaka J. No. 31 ; Nanda J. No. 39 ; Illīsa J. No. 78 ; Kaṭāhaka J. No. 125 ; Kāka J. No. 140 ; Uraga J. No. 354 ; Bilārikosiya J. No. 450 ; Gaṇḍatīndu J. No. 520 ; Kusa J. No. 531 ; Kuṇāla J. No. 536 ; Khaṇḍahāla J. No. 542.
3. Barua, Inscriptions of Aśoka, Pt. II, 307.
4. No. 545 ; Also cf. Arthaśāstra, III. 13 ; Nārada, V. 26-28 ; IC. IV. 438 ; Barua, Op. Cit. 307 ; Law, Indological Studies, II. 78 ; JIH. XXXII 264.

(*bhayā bhavanti*). There are references to the sale and purchase of slaves. It is said that the slaves were bought for 700 kahāpaṇas[1]. There were also maid-servants (*dāsīs*), female personal attendants (*paricārikā*) and nurses (*dhātīs*)[2].

There are statements in the Pālī Nikāyas to show that male and female-slaves were received as gifts by certain sects of the Śramaṇas and the Brāhmaṇas[3]. The Buddha however, prohibits five trades on the part of a lay-worshipper, the second of which is *sattavaṇijjā* explained by Buddhaghosa as *manussa-vaṇijjā*, "traffic in human beings".[4] The Buddha paints slavery or servitude as "a state of woe" and compares it with "the state of indebtedness, disease, imprisonment and journey across a wilderness". He not only abstained from receiving the slaves—male and female—as gift but also restrained his disciples from it.[5]

The position of the women in the society was slightly changed. They probably took part in works of public utility. They had their personal property, chiefly jewellery and clothes, which the daughters inherited from their mothers. The literature of the period definitely points to the development of the socio-moral and socio-economic

1. cf. Sattubhasta J. No. 402.
2. Nāṇachanda J. No. 289 ; Kumbhakāra J. No. 408 ; Susīma J. No. 411 ; Ghata J. No. 454 ; Ummadantī J. No. 527.
3. Barua, Op. Cit. 307.
4. cf. Aṅguttara Nikāya ; Pañcaka-Nipāta ; Upāsakavagga ; Barua, Op. Cit. 308.
5. Dīgha-Nikāya, I. 5 ; Barua, Op. Cit. 308 ; Also see JBORS., IX. 369-75.

life of the time. It appears that even the Buddha had nothing but hatred for the women, When Āmrapālī, the Vaiśālian courtesan goes to Buddha, his first impression of hers clearly indicates that woman to him, and for that matter, to the entire clan of the Bhikṣus was more ferocious than "falling into the mouth of the tiger" or "under the sharp knife of the executioner" because their "bewitching movements" and "beauty" robbed men "of their heart "[1]. The Jātakas are full of diatribes not only against the courtesans and drabs but against all women of the world. They found out forty ways by which a woman (other than a prostitute) can give hints of her inclination towards a man[2]. A woman was blamed if she frequented public parks, private gardens, river banks, houses of relatives, apartments of a stranger etc[3]. The climax is reached when it is declared in the Jātakas that "every woman is liable to fall from her virtuous path, as the proverb goes--'oceans, kings, Brāhmaṇas and women are the four eternal insatiates". Thus womanhood was talked out and every woman, according to the pious Buddhists, was either a "prostitute" or an "insatiate".

But, inspite of the vituperations hurled against the women we learn that Buddha admitted into his fold Āmrapālī[4] and Mahāpajapati Gautamī[5] (belonging to the Lord's family) along with 500 Śākya ladies, mostly prostitutes. It looks rather paradoxical that the Buddha and his apostles who

1. SBE. XIX; HPAI. Vol. I, 164-65; also cf. AIE., 462-63.
2. Kusa J. No. 531; Kuṇāla J. No. 535,
3. HPAI. Vol. I. 185.
4. For detailed information see Great Women of India, 264-65.
5 Ibid, 256-57; for Viśākhā, 270-74; AIE. 463.

were never tired of harping on the wiles of women should not only have intimately mixed with the courtesans, but have eaten their food, lived at their abode, accepted their contributions, read them sermons and finally converted them to their faith, thus proving, inspite of themselves, that women were not so black as they had been painted. The reason of this all lies in the fact that these women exerted immense influence, not only with the kings and nobles, but also with the masses, and that the conversion of the mistress of an establishment with several hundred *gaṇikās* affected as well as created a very favourable impression on the minds of a large number of people. It was undoubtedly a nice plan for any preacher bent on popularising his doctrines to have turned his whole heart in the conversion of these women of the town "having no place in the respectable household" and "reserved for the pleasures of the people"[1]. The stark reality, however, remains that the Buddha, here too, wanted to keep the nuns under perpetual subjection of the monks and his "Eight Laws" were nothing but the first step in this direction.

We have of course, both sides of the female character in the Buddhist literature, though unfortunately the black brush is flourished with much more enthusiasm than the white one, and with a vengeance as it were. Female-chastity was not rare. Modesty of women had already become a well-founded system, though the extent of their freedom was being much narrowed down. Imprisonment, mutilation, cleaving asunder and decapitation and sometimes even death were inflicted on women for violation of the vows of

1. HPAI., Vol. I, 178-79.

chastity. But the men gave free reins to their polygamous instincts. For obvious reasons, feminine modesty was made as brittle as a glass, so that it could remain "once broken, always broken". The harems of aristocracy sometimes abounded in swarms of *gaṇikās* and concubines[1]. We have references to dancing girls accomplished in the art of dancing and singing[2]. The kings often engaged sixteen thousand dancing girls[3]. Purdāh system was observed by women, though with occasional relaxations[4].

Dead bodies were disposed of "sometimes by exposure, sometimes by cremation and sometimes by burial". Corpses of ordinary persons were left to vultures. They were thrown into a public place called *sīvathika* or *āmakasuśāna*.

EDUCATION

Education was wide spread among Vaiśālians. The young Licchavis went to distant countries for higher education. Takṣaśilā was the most famous seat of learning. It attracted scholars from all parts of India. Numerous references in the Jātakas show how thither flocked students from far off Banaras[5], Rājagṛha[6], Mithilā[7], Ujjenī[8] and

1. Ibid. 185-90.
2. Cullapalobhana J. No. 263 ; JIH. XXXII. 250.
3. Bandhanamokkha J. No. 120 ; JIH XXXII. 250.
4. cf. Abhiṇha J. No. 27.
5. Pañcāvudha J. No. 55 ; Saṃkhadhamana J. No. 60 ; Asātarūpa J. No. 100 ; Duddada J. No. 180 ; Asadisa J. No. 181 ; Mahādhammapāla J. No. 447 ; Dūta J. No. 478 ; Sarabhaṅga J. No. 522 ; Saṃkicca J. No. 530.
6. Darīmukha J. No. 378 ; Cullasutasoma J. No. 525 ; Sonaka J. No 529.
7. Suruci J. No. 489 ; Mahāummagga J. No. 542.
8. Citta-sambhūta J. No. 498.

Kosala[1], from the "Central Region,"[2] and from the Sivi[3] and Kuru[4] kingdoms in the "North Country."[5] The fame of Takṣaśilā as a seat of learning was due to that of its "world-renowned" teachers who were authorities, specialists and experts in the subjects they professed. It was "the intellectual capital of the Indian continent." There was a steady movement of qualified students drawn from all classes and ranks of society towards Takṣaśilā to complete their higher education. "Thus the various centres of learning in the different parts of the country became affiliated, as it were, to the educational centre, or the central university, of Takṣaśilā which exercised a kind of intellectual suzerainty over the wide world of letters in India."[6]

Education of girls was also wide-spread. Some women of the Buddhist period were not behind their male brothers in education. The religious harangue of Sukka[7] and the philosophical discussion of Khemā[8] and Dhammadinnā[9] may be cited as instances of attainments of Indian

1. Brahachatta J. No. 336.
2. Ibid.
3. Ummadantī J. No. 527.
4. Koṭisimbali J. No. 412 ; Mahāsutasoma J. No. 537.
5. Bhīmasena J. No. 80.
6. AIE. 478.
7. Therīgāthā Commentary, 57 61 ; AIE. 466.
8. Ibid. 126 ff. ; Aṅguttara I, 25 ; AIE. 465.
9. Ibid. 15 ; Aṅguttara I, 25 ; AIE. 464 ; Law, Tribes in Ancient India, 321 ; for another distinguished woman. Vāsiṭṭhī, see Therigāthā, V, 133 ff ; Psalms of the Sisters, 23-24.

women during the period.[1] Mallinātha, the nineteenth Tīrthaṅkara of the Jainas was a princess of Mithilā, the daughter of Kumbha, the ruler of Mithilā.[2] The Jātakas, however, do not mention any female-student going to Takṣaśilā for higher education.

From the Jātakas it appears that restrictions were put on the education of the Cāṇḍālas. We read of two Cāṇḍāla boys from Ujjenī who, considering the misery of their lot due to their birth, disguised themselves as Brāhmaṇas and were admitted to learn law from a teacher at Takṣaśilā. Their disguise was, however, detected and they were at once expelled.[3]

The city of Vaiśālī itself was a prominent seat of learning.[4] Buddha had often high spiritual conversations with the Licchavis. For holding religious and philosophical discussions the Licchavis had erected the Kuṭāgāra hall where the Buddha gave many discourses to them.

Banaras was another seat of learning. It ranked next to Takṣaśilā. " It was, however, largely the creation of the ex-students of Takṣaśilā, who set up asteachers at Banaras and carried thither the culture of that cosmopolitan educational centre which was moulding the intellectual life of the whole of India."[5]

1. cf. AIE. 463-66; Great Women of India, 256-74 & 275-84; JIH. XXXII. 250ff.
2. Great Women of India. 277-78.
3. Citta-Sambhūta J. No. 498.
4. Cullakāliṅga J. No. 301.
5. AIE, 490; Losaka J, No 41.

There were also teachers of world-wide fame.[1] There were again certain subjects in the teaching of which Banaras seems to have specialised, e. g. music. Besides these centres of learning, the hermitages of the truth-seekers, who renounced the world, served as schools of higher philosophical speculation and religious training " where the culture previously acquired would attain its fruitage or a further development in a particular direction."[2]

ART

In early Buddhism we come across a vague sort of ban on all art which was considered as motivated by the ideal of mere ephemeral pleasure. The psychological attitude of early Buddhist aesthetic is clearly summed up in the Visuddhi Magga—" Living beings, on account of their love and devotion to the sensations, excited by the forms and objects of sense, give high honour to painters, musicians, perfumers, cooks and elixir-prescribing physicians and other like persons who furnish with objects of sense."[3] And, " beauty is nothing to me," says the Dasadhamma Sutta, "neither the beauty of the body nor that which comes of dress." Moreover, this was an age predominantly of gay and splendorous living. The seductive charms of lovely women, " adorned, garlanded and redolent of sandal wood" are a favourite theme of refined connoisseurs of Buddhist literature. The monks of the brotherhood were expressly forbidden to paint pictures on the monasteries, symbols of wreath and creepers in stūpas, enjoined by Buddha for worship.

1. AIE. 490.
2. Ibid. 490-91.
3. Quoted in Mulkraj Anand's, Hindu View of Art, 82.

The passage of time, however, dulled their enthusiasm and Buddhism now ceased to be a mere code of ethics. On the other hand, it became a religious system, being profoundly influenced by Brāhmaṇical theism. It was then that fine arts began to be practised enthusiastically by the followers of Buddhism. Licchavi youths went to Takṣaśilā to learn *śilpa* or arts. Buildings of shrines, *caityas*, monasteries, inside and outside the city, became the order of the day. The Bhikṣus were master-builders and themselves superintended the constructions of such buildings[1] like their counterparts in medieval Europe who excelled in many of the fine arts—painting, architecture, sculpture, & etc. The *Vatthuvijjācariyas* were those who knew how to test the sites for house-building[2]. The Buddhist literature abounds in the descriptions of the building of a house showing the materials used, and we have base-reliefs showing the general design of the frontage. The Mahā-Ummagga Jātaka[3] contains an elaborate description of the underground palace, "a sort of Welbeck Abbey of ancient days." Another sort of building historically interesting were the hot-air-baths.[4] "It is very curious to find at this very early date in the Ganges Valley a sort of bathing so closely resembling our modern so-called 'Turkish Baths.' "

A story in Cullavagga[5], however, shows that the Bhikṣus exhorted and taught only those men who provided

1. Cullavagga VI (SBE. XX, 189-90.)
2. Takka J. No. 63 ; Suruci J. No. 489.
3. No. 546.
4. Vinaya Texts, III. 105-10, 297.
5. VI. SBE. XX, 190.

them with requisite clothes, food, lodging and medicine, i. e., wealthy persons—a weakness which Buddha, too, sometimes betrayed.

The big houses and buildings were mostly to be found in crowded and noisy cities. The big houses, however, must have been few in number. There was probably a tangle of narrow and evil-smelling streets of one-storeyed wattle and daub huts with thatched roofs, the meagre dwelling-places of the poor. The villagers kept up their tradition of huts made of straw and clay. Since then there have been little changes in their way of life. It also appears that people following the same occupation lived together and the locality in which they resided was named after their vocation. We have references to *Vaddhikogāma* (village of smiths) ; *Nesādagāma* (village of hunters), and *Brāhmaṇagāma* (village of Brāhmaṇas). We have numerous references to *Kulas* or families, e. g., *Nesāda-Kula, Vena-Kula, Rathakāra-Kula* & etc.[1].

ECONOMY

The rural economy of India during the period was based chiefly on a system of village communities of land-owners or what in Europe is known as peasant-proprietorship. A study in the Jātakas shows that the essential features of economic conditions were that the majority of the people lived by agriculture; that there were craftsmen who used to cater to the simple needs of the people and that there were tradesmen who used to carry on trade

1. K. B. Pathak Com. Vol. 71.

within the country and outside it—both in land and maritime trade[1].

AGRICULTURE

Agriculture was, as in modern times, the main occupation of the people. A grāma or village was an inhabited settlement, not regularly fortified as a city, nor containing the King's palace. The number of families in a village averagely ranged from 30 to 1000. Near the village was the sacred grove of trees. There were pastures and forests.

The village-superintendent or Headman (*gāma-bhojaka*) was the most important personage in the village. He collected taxes for the king, settled quarrels and exacted fines from the guilty[2]. Whenever crops failed he promised meat to the villagers[3]. The villagers generally lived a happy and contented life, and managed their own affairs. There were watchmen who guarded the fields[4]. There were gardeners[5], wood-gatherers[6], doctors[7], fishermen, ferrymen, smiths, tailors, beaters of drum and blowers of conches, bathers & etc[8]. There was sufficiency for simple needs. There was security and independence.

1. cf. Cullakaseṭṭhi J. No. 4 ; Apaṇṇaka J. No. 1.
2. Kharassara J. No. 79 ; Ubhatobhaṭṭha J. No. 139.
3. Buch, I, 24 ; also see Rhys Davids, Buddhist India, Chap. III.
4. Sīhacamma J. No. 189.
5. Cullakaseṭṭhi J. No. 4 ; Darīmukha J. No. 378.
6. Devadhamma J. No. 6 ; Bhaddasāla J. No. 465.
7. Visavanta J. No. 69.
8. Ubhatobhaṭṭha J. No. 139 ; Avāriya J. No. 376 ; Sucī J. No. 387 ; Mātaṅga J. No. 497 ; Bherivāda J. No. 59 ; Saṃkha-dhamana J. No. 60 ; Mūgapakkha J. No. 538 ; Dasabrāhmaṇa J. No. 495.

FAMINE

Famines often ravaged the lands and marred the happiness of the unfortunate villagers. The Mahāvastu says that once famine ravaged the city of Vaiśālī to such an extent that people died in large numbers. The smell of the decaying bodies attracted evil spirits and many inhabitants were attacked by intestinal diseases. Buddha was invited. As soon as he set his foot on the Vajjian soil there was a thunder-storm, and rain fell in torrents[1]. As in modern times, so in those days people had to live more or less under similar economic conditions.

TAXES

There are no direct evidences of such taxes as tithe on raw produce collected as a yearly tax or forced labour (*rājakariya*), being levied on the common wealth by any of the republics or oligarchies mentioned in Buddhist literature. The villagers held it degradation, to which only dire necessity would drive them to work for hire. Big merchants and land-owners, however, had in their service a number of hired people who worked for them[2]. The great mass of the people were well-to-do peasantry, or handicraftsmen, mostly with land of their own, both classes ruled over by local headmen of their own selection[3].

1 Also cf. Theragāthā, V. 55 & Comm. ; **Psalms of the Brethren** (PTS.), 56 ; Homage, 126.

2. Buch. II, 244-46.

3. Buddhist India (2nd. Ed.), 63.

TRADE & COMMERCE

Trade and commerce were in a very flourishing condition. Sea-trade was an important part of commerce. Folk-memory could not forget the plucky men who daily risked their lives in the limitless sea. So, there arose folk-tales with sea-men—"*samudra-yānitakas*" and "*samudra-vaṇiks*" as their heroes. From these tales[1] we gather that in all the great cities of Eastern India, such as Śrāvastī (capital of Kosala) ; Vārāṇasī (Banaras), Rājagṛha (capital of Magadha) ; Vaiśālī (capital of the Licchavis) ; Campā (capital of Aṅga) etc. there were merchants engaged in sea-borne trade. Merchants from inland cities travelled to the sea-ports in caravans with their merchandise e. g., jewels diamonds, gold-dishes. cotton-goods, wool silver, horses, and other commodities ("*mahāsamudra gamanīyam paṇyam*"). Sea-going vessels were called *Vāhanam*. There were trade-routes which passed many a wilderness manifested by robbers, demons, lions, and other wild beasts Merchants from Suppāraka (Sopārā) to Sāvatthī from Banaras to Baveru (ancient Babylon), Bharukaccha (Broach) and Svarṇabhūmi (Burma) and from Videha to Gandhāra used to come and go.

From the Jātakas we learn that there were two main sea-routes—(*i*) the *Dakṣiṇāpatha* which was from Rājagṛha to Pratiṣṭhāna on the Godāvarī, via Śrāvastī and Sāketa and (*ii*) the *Uttarāpatha* which was from Śravastī to Takṣa-

1. cf. Apaṇṇaka J. No. 1 ; Vaṇṇupatha J. No. 2 ; Serivāṇija J.No. 3 ; Taṇḍulanāli J. No. 5 ; Illīsa J. No. 78 ; Gagga J. No. 155 ; Valāhassa J. No. 196 ; Guttila J. No. 243, etc.

śilā via Mathurā across the sandy desert of Rajputana. Besides these two main routes, there were trade-routes from Banaras to Ujjenī[1], Videha[2], via Kashmir to Gandhāra, Banaras to Śrāvastī[3], Rājagṛha to Śrāvastī[4], Magadha to Sauvīra[5] and Campā to Tāmralipti[6].

There were two main land-routes connecting Bihar with other parts of the country – (*i*) Rājagṛha to Puṣkalāvatī and (*ii*) Rājagṛha to Paṭiṭhāna (Pratiṣṭhāna). The route from Rājagṛha to Śrāvastī and then to Kausāmbī was used by the Buddha. The Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta says that the route from Rājagṛha to Kauśāmbī passed through Rājagṛha, Pāṭaliputra, Vaiśālī, Kuśīnagara, Kapilavastu, Śrāvastī and Kausāmbī[7].

According to the Cullavagga there were roads from Vaiśālī to Sahajāti[8], and Rājagṛha to Kausāmbī. The Vajjian Bhikṣus went from Vaiśālī to Sahajāti[9] on the Southern coast via Kānyakubja[10]. There were other roads *viz.* Mithilā to Gandhāra via Kashmir, Mithilā to Campā, Banaras to Ujjenī and Mithilā to Kapila and Indra-

1. Guttila J. No. 243.
2. Gandhāra J. No. 406.
3. Jarudapāna J. No. 256.
4. Suttanipāta, 1012-1013.
5. Vimānavatthu Aṭṭhakathā, 336.
6. Mahājanaka J. No. 539 ; Vinaya Texts, I, 81 ; Buddhist India (1st. Ed.), 103.
7. JIH. XXXII. 123.
8. Cullavagga. XII. 1. 9.
9. Ibid. VII. 2. 5.
10. Vimānavaṭṭhu Aṭṭhakathā, 370, 336.

prastha[1], Sākala to Kuśīvati[2] and Campā to Vārāṇasī via Pāṭaligrāma[3].

Thus the traders of Vaiśālī, Mithilā, Rājagṛha and Campā in their hey-day proved to the world that they were men of wonderful adventurous talents. They crossed the seas by boats and cleared off the vast inlands extending between the Bay of Bengal and the southern Chinese Ocean and the Islands of Jāvā, Sumitrā, Borneo, etc., which were then covered with forests and inhabited by the primitive hunting tribes. They established their colonies in those far off Islands. And, on the eastern coast which is today universally known as Indo-China, they established a city after the name of one of their famous cities, i.e. Campā[4].

Moreover, Mithilā also established colonies in South China especially in Yunnan in the early centuries of the Christian era and named certain towns and principalities after Mithilā and Videha[5].

GUILDS

Buddhist literature abounds in references to the guilds of work-people. The hereditary craftsmen or those who followed professional callings e.g., architects, carpenters, smiths, masons, jewellers, potters, fishermen and others organised themselves into various guilds. They agreed to

1. cf. Gandhāra J. No. 406 ; Mahājanaka J. No. 539 ; Guttila J. No. 243 ; Mahāummagga J. No. 546.
2. Kusa J. No. 531.
3. Sīlānisaṃsa J. No. 196 ; Saṃkha J. No. 442.
4. Homage, 20.
5. Laksman Jha, Mithilā will Rise, 13.

be governed by their own laws and customs. Persons following common professions lived in the same locality. The social progress was further complicated by the general tendency to segregate one class of workers from another within the same profession[1].

It appears, however, that guilds had attained a high degree of perfection with their own laws and usages and officers. We have mention of the Seṭhis of Rājgir (Rājagṛha) and Banaras. Anāthapiṇḍika, the celebrated merchant, is referred to in the Jātaka as *Mahāseṭṭhi.* The term *seniyo* refers to the 'head of guilds'. Eighteen trade-guilds are frequently mentioned. The *Jetthaka* or *pamukha* of a village of one thousand smiths is referred to as one who combined in himself the functions of the Headman of the village and the village-syndic. The president of the local guild is described as a favourite of the king "rich and of great substance."[2] The guilds had also powers of arbitration between the members of the guild and their wives. Disputes between one guild and another were settled by the *mahā-seṭṭhi*, the Lord High Treasurer "who acted as a sort of chief Alderman over the Aldermen of the guilds."[3]

COINAGE.

A few banking facilities probably existed. Money was hoarded in secluded places so that it may not be

1. JIH. XXXII. 251.
2. JBORS, 1922, pt. IV, 39-40, 45-47; Buddhist India. (2nd Ed.), 57-60.
3. Ibid, 60.

exacted by force or be stolen, and as a safe provision against famines[1]. There used to be exchange by barter[2]. *Māsaka*[3], *addamāsaka*[4], *pāda*, *addhapāda*, *kahāpaṇa* and *addha-kahāpaṇa*[5], were in use Copper coins were there, ' No silver coins were used and references to gold coins are late and doubtful''. According to Durga Prasad, however, copper and silver punchmarked coins were current in the time of the Buddha in different states. "The punch-marked coins of Buddha and pre-Buddha periods of a different standard weight of 25 Rattis, classed as early coins, bearing 4 bold and rarely one to two symbols, of crude but bold and simple designs, and found from particular identified localities of the ancient independent kingdoms were in circulation from the middle of the sixth century B.C. and earlier back to the 7th or 8th century B.C."[6]. The *pāda* or $\frac{1}{4}$ of 100 Rattis standard weight coins discovered in the Paila hoard was current in the life-time of the Buddha and the Janakas as well[7].

RELIGION

The Brāhmaṇical religion or the religion of the Vedas was confined to a small section of the people. Among the various revolts springing up inevitably against the

1. K. B. Pathak Com. Vol. 74-75; Buddhist India, 62; JBORS, 1922, pt. IV, 53.
2. cf. Taṇḍulanāli J. No. 5.
3. cf. Visayha J. No. 340.
4. cf. Sutano J. No. 398.
5. cf. Gaṅgamāla J. No. 421.
6. JRAS. (N. S.) 1937.
7. AIN. 80.

Upaniṣadic philosophy two were most important in the centuries before Christ—Buddhism and Jainism. At the time of the rise of the former the worship of the popular deity Śrī or Sirī, the goddess of luck, of plenty, and success; spirits of the earth and the great mountains; the Four Great Kings (guardians of the four quarters); tree-worship, serpent-worship, river-worship etc. were prevalent. The mass of the people believed in spells, incantations, charms and spirits. The religion of the mass was, therefore, purely animistic[1]. The heretical views of the time were vehemently condemned by the Buddha as "fruitless". Though there was a real and progressive civilisation and ideas and customs were no doubt changing and throwing, there was a certain dead level, if not a complete absence of philosophic thought. Then suddenly and almost simultaneously, there is evidence about the 6th century B.C. in each of these centres of civilisation, "of a leap forward in speculative thoughts, of a new birth in ethics, of a religion of conscience,"[2] i. e., the rise of Buddhism. Brāhmaṇism had now become like 'an island in a sea". Majority of the people followed the new Order.

Vaiśālī proved a very fruitful soil, both for Buddhism and Jainism. These religions found many followers among its inhabitants. Few places in India have stronger claims upon the veneration of the Buddhists and the Jainas. But, notwithstanding the stronghold of Buddhism and Jainism, the Licchavis of Vaiśālī, the great body of the people of the Vajji country remained staunch followers of their

1. K. B. Pathak Com. Vol. 76-79; Buddhist India 144 ff.
2. Ibid, 155-56.

ancient faith. The Licchavis also performed 'caitya-worship'. It is difficult to determine the principal object of this worship. There is, however, nothing to show that the religious belief of the Licchavis was in any way different from the form of worship prevalent in other parts of Northern India.

Buddhism at this early stage was a form of faith for ascetics only, not a religious creed for all people. The Buddhists formed only one of the many ascetic sects of Northern India. The Vedic religion was still in full vigour in N. E. India as the references to Vedic sacrifices in the Buddhist books show. It was the same place (ie., the country of the Vajjis, the sacred land of the Videhas) where the great Samrāṭ Janaka held his sway and Yājñavalkya preached the White Yajurveda. The Vedic gods—Indra, Prajāpati or Brahmā were still very popular deities in the regions where the Buddha preached[1].

Mahāvīra the twentyfourth Tīrthaṅkara of the Jainas, was a citizen of Vaiśālī. He spent the early part of his life there. When an ascetic he is said to have resided in his native town or the immediate neighbourhood for twelve rainy seasons. Even before his advent. the faith of which he was the last exponent, seems to have been prevalent in Vaiśālī and the country round. in some other form.[2]. The *śramaṇas* or the wandering ascetics, whose followers Mahāvīra's parents were. had been in existence ever since the time of the earlier Upaniṣads. They belonged to one of the numerous sects of the time. Mahāvīra developed and preached his faith of unbounded charity. The number

1. cf, Law, Some Kṣatriya Tribes, 69 ff.
2. Law, Tribes in Ancient India, 318 ff.

of his followers among the Licchavis, appears to have been considerably large. Some of them belonged to the highest order.

Buddha, the "Light of Asia" was a scion of the Śākya family. He loved Vaiśālī and the Licchavis so much that he paid at least three visits to the city. The Licchavis sought his help on numerous occasions for the solution of their problems. "The Confederacy of the Vajjians in Eastern India looked up to him as adviser on critical occasions in national politics"[1]. From the king in the palace to the beggar in the street, from the most serious man of the time to the notorious boys of the field—all listened to him in reverence and paid their worshipful obeisance[2].

But it seems, all was not well with the Master towards the end of his life. Inspite of steel-framed rules, the nunnery incourse of time became the last refuge of a heterogenous group of criminals (i. e., the *Bhikṣuṇīs*), and worst forms of debauchery gradually crept in. The degeneration of the Buddhist Saṃghas was so horrible that in his last days the Master had to bitterly lament before his disciple Ānanda for the " great mistake" he had committed "in permitting women into his holy order"[3].

Thus, the great "religious empire" reared up by the genius and life-blood of the Buddha fell into weaker hands. They were too inefficient to shoulder the responsibility that the great Master had assigned them. And, only a hundred

1. Sarkar. Creative India, 26.
2. Homage, 85-90.
3. Vinaya Texts III, 325-26.

years after the passing away of the Master, the *Vajjiputtaka Bhikṣus*[1] and the residents of Vaiśālī indulged in practices utterly prejudicial and detrimental to the interests of Buddhism. They proclaimed ten "indulgences" as permissible[2]. In order to suppress the heresies among them (the *Vajjiputtakas*) the Buddhist Elders convened a Council at Vaiśālī, known as the *Sattasatika* or the Convocation of the Seven Hundred. The assembled Bhikṣus were brought together by venerable Yaśa. In the course of discussions, the interrogation of Revata and exposion of the Vinaya by Sabbakāmi and the ten "indulgences" having been thoroughly inquired into, a judgement of suppression was finally pronounced[3]. But the following century again witnessed schisms in the Buddhist clan-this time too wide to be bridged, with the result that Buddhism, ironically enough, was wiped out of the very land of its inception.

Decline Of The Vajjian Confederacy

Several causes are attributed to the decline and fall of this most powerful republic (c. 543-44 B.C.). According to Jayaswal, during the age of the Mauryas the Mauryan policy was to allow honourable existence to those republics which were strong and united in leagues. Those, which were isolated, were to be weakened by a policy of internal

1. A school of Buddhist thought, known to have formulated the "Theory of Personality" unacceptable to the orthodox interpreters of Buddhism.
2. Kern, Manual of Buddhism, 103 ; JASB. VI, pt. ii, 728.
3. Law, Some Kṣatriya Tribes, 89 ff.

division, and then reduced by force[1]. Weaker states succumbed to the mighty Magadhan sword whereas the stronger ones survived. The Vajjian Confederacy was too strong to be conquered by easy means. It was, therefore, natural that the Mauryan emperors should seek to some different means to materialise their plan successfully. Thanks to the shrewd policy of Bimbisāra who, by war and marriage (with the ruling families of Madra, Kosala, and Vaiśālī) had paved the way for the realisation of the great imperialistic ambitions of his son and successor-Ajātaśatru (Vedehīputto). He "not only humbled Kosala and permanently annexed Kāśī but also absorbed the state of Vaiśālī"[2]. It was, indeed, a tragic fight of blood against blood, which marked a turning point in the history of ancient India.

Different books lay down different causes of this Magadha-Vajji-episode, According to the Sumaṅgala-vilāsinī[3] there was a mine of gems or some precious substance (*Mahoggha-bhaṇḍa*) at the foot of a hill near the Gaṅgā. An agreement was reached between Ajātaśatru and the Licchavis that the gems should be divided equally between them. The Licchavis, however, broke the agreement and took away all the precious gems. When Ajātaśatru came to know of it he grew ferociously offended. This in turn aggravated the crisis.

1. HP (1st. Ed.), 141.
2. PHAI[6], 210.
3. Burmese edition, pt. II. 99 ; Law, Buddhistic Studies, 199; Law, Buddhaghosa, III ; DPPN. II, 781; Vinaya Piṭaka, I. 228 ; Udana VIII 6; Divyāvadāna II. 522 ; Aṅguttara Nikāya II. 35.

The Jaina texts[1] say that the cause of the conflict was the state-elephant—*Seyaṇāga* (*Secanaka*, the "sprinkler") with its huge necklace of eighteen strings of jewels given by Bimbisāra to his younger sons Halla and Vehalla born from his wife Cellaṇā, the daughter of Rājā Ceṭaka of Vaiśālī. They escaped together with the elephant and pearls to their grandfather, Ceṭaka for seeking protection against Ajātaśatru who had usurped his father's throne. At the instigation of his wife Paūmāvaī (Padmāvatī) Ajātaśatru demanded from his younger brothers the return of both the gifts. The latter refused. Having thus failed to peacefully obtain the extradition of the fugitives Kuṇika commenced war with Ceṭaka.

The Vajjians, puffed up with their power and prosperity, attacked Ajātaśatru several times. This enraged him and he prepared for crushing the enemies once for all[2].

The Buddhist literature clearly states that inspite of blood-relations the Licchavis and Ajātaśatru were never on good terms. The latter constantly harboured the impression that Abhaya, his foster-brother (son of Bimbisāra by Āmrapālī, a Vaiśālian courtesan) had Licchavi blood in his veins and as such he preferred the Licchavis. If ever a war broke out between the two, Abhaya would side with the Licchavis, making it very difficult for him to

1. Uvāsagadasāo, II. Appendix, p. 7; ("न दद्यास्तदा युद्धसज्जो भवामीति"—Avaśyaka Sūtra, 684); also cf. Tawney, Kathākośa, 176 ff.
2. Buddhist Suttas, SBE. XI, 18; Si-Yu-Ki. Bk. IX.

cope with the new situation[1]. Hence his resolve to do away with them.

But, the most important of all the causes leading to this war, and for that matter any other wars of the world waged till now, was the imperialistic ambition or expansionist policy of Ajātaśatru. This irresistibly inspired him to grab the innumerable wealth of the Vajjian Confederacy, as has usually been the case with all the power-puffed conquerors of the world. The powerful Vajjian Confederacy stood like an immovable rock in the way of his northern expansion. The rock must break, come what may, if the Magadhan empire were to expand and flourish. It was, therefore, a purely political motive that actuated him to precipitate war and extend his domination over the neighbouring powers by all possible means.

But the subjugation of the Licchavis—leaders of the powerful federation of thirtysix states—was not an easy task. They were strong in their internal republican unity–at the zenith of power and prosperity. So, a military show-down on his part, without diplomacy or destroying their unity by creating dissensions among the rank and file, would prove abortive. He must, therefore, take recourse freely to the three means prescribed in political treatises for the subjugation of a hostile state, i. e,. (i) machinations (*chala*), (ii) military strength (*bala*) and (iii) strategy (*kauśala*)[2]. Attempts at working out his designs got under way feverishly. Thanks to the Machiavellian tactics adopted by the Magadhan statesmen headed by the wily

1. Law, Tribes in Ancient India, 329.
2. HC., 189-90.

Brāhmaṇa Vassakāra, his minister who sowed seeds of dissensions among the Vaiśālians by playing up one against another. In course of time he disunited them and prepared the ground for the final show-down[1]. That this was pre-planned is clear from the accounts given in the Mahāvagga and Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta, which relate the story of the building of a fort at Pāṭaliputra by Ajātaśatru's ministers, for Rājagṛha was too far inland to serve as a base of operations against the distant Licchavis on the other side of the Gaṅgā[2].

Having thus fully armed himself Ajātaśatru declared–"I will root out these Vajjians, might and powerful though they be, I will destroy these Vajjians, I will bring these Vajjians to utter ruin"[3] The declaration was followed by actual military operations against the Vaiśālians who were by now too disunited, due to internal dissensions, to resist the enemy. The inevitable happened. Ceṭaka called together the eighteen Gaṇa-Rājās of Kāśī and Kosala, together with the Licchavis and the Mallikas to offer combined resistance. Thus it was for Ajātaśatru "not a war against single state but an entire federation of three dozens of powerful republics of Eastern India on the one side of the Gaṅgā". This reminds us "of the tussle of the Samnites, Etruscans and Gauls with the rising power of Rome"[4].

1. Dialogues II, 78 ; Law, Kṣatriya Tribes, 112-15 ; DPPN. II. 846; JRAS, 1931; Gradual Sayings, IV. 12; PHAI[6], 213 ff ; Saṃyutta Nikāya (PTS) II. 268 ; Divyāvadāna II. 522 ; Majjhima Nikāya, III. 8.
2. SBE., XI, 1-5 ; XVII, 101 ; Gradual Sayings IV. 14, etc.
3. cf. The Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta, SBE. XI., 1-5 etc.
4. PHAI[6], 213.

In this long and arduous war—probably well over 16 years (562–546 B.C.), —the Vajjians were defeated and subdued as is clear from their reluctant slogan, "let us defend ourselves with closed gates". Ajātaśatru entered by the wide open gates, after putting them to great calamities[1]. On the ruins of the crushed Vajjians the great Magadhan empire was later consolidated and extended.

THE LATER LICCHAVIS

Of the subsequent history of the mighty Licchavis we know very little. For a long period their existence is shrouded in mystery. It appears, however, that unlike the smaller republics the Licchavis survived and escaped ignominious extermination. They were probably independent in matters of internal management and maintained their ancient democratic institutions[2].

A passage in Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra speaks of them two centuries later as living under a Saṃgha form of government. The celebrated statesman advised king Candragupta Maurya to seek the help of these Saṃghas which, on account of their unity and concord, were almost unconquerable.[3] This shows that notwithstanding their reverses they maintained a good deal of independence under Candragupta Maurya. The discovery of seals, particularly seal No. 800 (Pl. L)[4] bearing the inscription

1. JASB, 1839, p. 994 fn.-996 fn.
2. Law, Some Kṣatriya Tribes, 116.
3. Quoted, Ibid, 116.
4. Arch. Surv. Ind. Ann. Rep., 1913-14, p. 116.

"*Vesālī anusaṃyānaka-ṭakāre*" i. e., "(seal of) the Vaiśālī Police at Takāra"; the terracottas; the punch-marked coins and the fragments of stone with Mauryan polish definitely prove their insubordination to the Magadhan Empire. But, they maintained their independent character for history shows that "they again became a power after the decline of the Śuṅgas and the Kāṇvas" and their prestige, power, and military strength was very considerable[1]. The Guptas could rise to imperial status only by their matrimonial alliances with the republican Licchavis. The Licchavis had thus outlived their ancient contemporaries in power and glory and remained the single and sole representative of ancient republicanism, while the Āndhras the Yavanas, the Yaudheyas, the Madras, the Mālavas and Kṣudrakas, the Śivis, the Arjunāyanas, the Śūdras and the Abhiras, the Kukuras, the Vṛṣṇis, the Audambaras, etc. fell one by one before the imperialistic power[2].

The association of the Licchavis with Nepal and the Guptas in the first and fourth century A. D. respectively is of great interest. The account of Yuan Chwang says that in the first half of the 7th. century A. D. Aṃśuvarman (*An-shu-fa-me*), a scion of the Licchavi family ruled over Nepal[3]. This shows that a branch of the Licchavis had already moved into Nepal and established there. The Vaṃśāvali and the inscriptions[4] record that they were Sūryavaṃśī Licchavis. They ruled for three centuries or

1. Homage. 70.
2. cf. HP², 162 ff.
3. Beal, II. 81; also cf. Regmi, Ancient & Medieval Nepal, 49.
4. No. 15, IA. IX. 163 ff.

even more. Probably they established a monarchical government in the first century A. D and started an era in 111 A. D.[1]. Jayadeva I was their first historical king. From this "conquering" king (Jayadeva I) to Jayadeva II (759 A. D.) the last king of the line, altogether 33 kings ruled[2].

The Tibetan records tell us that the earliest kings of Tibet belonged to the *Li-tsa-bya* race and their first king came from a foreign country. This common origin of the Licchavis and the Tibetans definitely indicates that whereas a group of Licchavis settled down in Nepal another group proceeded towards Tibet and established their supremacy by seizing the Tibetan throne. There existed some sort of relation between the Licchavis of Vaiśālī and those of Tibet and Nepal. The Licchavis of Nepal were the followers of Buddhism and Brāhmaṇism. In their time the Vaiṣṇava as well as the Śaiva and Śākta shrines of Nepal came into prominence (650 A. D.). The shrine of Śiva Paśupatinātha deserves special mention. This proves beyond doubt that their original birth-place was Vaiśālī where both these cults (Buddhism and Brāhmaṇism) flourished side by side[3].

The Licchavis probably ruled for sometime over Magadha. According to the Nepalese inscription of Jayadeva II Licchavi, his ancestor Supuṣpa was born at

1. Levi, Le Nepal, I, 14.
2. IA. IX. 163 ff ; XV, 342-51, 97-98 ; CHI., I, 134-35 ; DHNI, I, 188; Homage, 72 ; B.C. Law Vol. pt. I. 627, 636-37; Rapson, Indian Coins. 32 ; JRASB. XVI, 1950. No. 2., pp. 180, 184.
3. JRASB, XVI, 1950, No. 2, p. 184.

Pāṭaliputra about the first century A. D. They probably acknowledged Kuśāna suzerainty when Kaniṣka's minister Vanaśpara marched against Magadha. This may also explain the alliance of Candragupta I with the Licchavis[1]. Nothing definite, however, can be said about Supuṣpa and his followers. But it is certain that (*i*) the Nepal branch of the Licchavis originally belonged to Vaiśālī whence they migrated to Nepal, probably after their serious reverses at the hands of the Magadhan rulers, and (*ii*) they had no matrimonial alliances with the Guptas. They are referred to as having been conquered and subjugated by Samudragupta, where as those Licchavis, having matrimonial alliances with the Guptas, are distinctly referred to as "*Licchavayaḥ*" pointing to their republican form of government.

Scholars generally agree that at the beginning of the fourth century A. D. Candragupta I and his Licchavi queen Kumāradevi issued gold coins along with their names inscribed on the field Samudragupta in his Allahabad Pillar inscription takes pride in describing himself as "*Licchavi-dauhitra*", *ie.*, "the son of a daughter of the Licchavis". This shows that about the 4th. century A.D. when the Guptas rose to eminence, the Licchavis possessed considerable political power. They were provisionally located in North Bihar with Vaiśālī as its centre[2]. Their power gradually passed into a hereditary family like the Mālavas, the Saṇakānikas & etc. Since the Licchavi state is indicated by the plural term "*Licchavayaḥ*" on the coins

1. Mookerji, The Gupta Empire, 8.
2. NHIP. VI. 130.

of Candragupta I, the republican form of government probably still continued. The hereditary President acted according to the wishes of the Licchavi family[1].

The Licchavi state was soon amalgamated with the Gupta empire and functioned as a sort of dual monarchy. According to R. C. Majumdar, towards the close of the third and the beginning of the fourth century A.D. no permanent power ruled in northern India, and it "presented the spectable which usually follows the disintegration of an empire". Independent states—both monarchical and non-monarchical—had sprung up in the whole country. Two of them in eastern India were the Licchavi state and the principality founded by Gupta. They were later on united by a marriage-alliance[2].

THEIR FINAL EXIT

The break-down of the Imperial line of rhe Gupta kings seems to have carried with it the desertion and ruin of Vaiśālī—the land of the great Licchavis and Videhas,

1. Ibid., 128-29 ; Homage, 70-77.
2. NHIP, VI. 133. Majumdar has thrown an interesting light on a famous city in Arakan, named Vaiśālī built in 789 A. D. by a king of Candra dynasty. For two centuries it retained its position as a capital town and a strong-hold of Indian culture, especially of Buddhism. It is now known as Wethālī, the local pronunciation of Vaiśāli, an insignificant village in Akyāb district. Burmese chronicles have also preserved a long story about the marriage of Aniruddha, the great king of Pagan (1044-1077 A. D.) with a princess of Vaiśālī whose son ascended the throne and attained great fame. (Vide—Homage, 43).

the torch-bearer of the most powerful ancient republic and the undying glory and crowning achievement of the Indian people. It does not seem to have risen again as it did after the dissolution of the Śuṅga and Kāṇva kingdoms[1]. At the time of Yuan Chwang's visit in 635 A. D. the city was mostly in ruins The buildings had been uprooted and the numerous lakes and ponds had shrunk into offensive swamps. The Jainas and Brāhmaṇical Hindus were there. The Buddhists remained probably until the conquest of the country by the Mohammedans. This is testified to by the Buddhist images that have turned up among the ruins[2].

No republics except that of the Licchavis lasted in history for a thousand years. Neither Athens, nor the republics of Venice and Genova can claim a similar greatness. The non-mon archical tradition with the departure of the Licchavis from the Indian political stage became a thing of the past, and by the end of the 5th. century A. D. republics disappeared from Hindu India. The old Licchavis quitted the political scene. The young Puṣyamitras vanished in the air.[3] The following century saw the final exit of Hindu constitutionalism from the stage of history. "All that was good, come down from the age of Vedic Forefathers, all that progress which had been achieved since the composition of the first Rk, all that gave life to the mechanism of State, bade good-by to the Land. Republicanism was the first to begin the Great

1. Homage, 71.
2. Arch. Surv. Ind. Ann. Rep. 1903-04, p. 88.
3. HP². 164.

Departure, to lead the dirge of political *nirvāṇa*. From 550 A. C. onwards Hindu history melts into brilliant biographies—isolated gems without a common string of national and common life ".[1] The community ceased to breathe freedom. And, the old life refused to return.

1. Ibid. 164.

CHAPTER IV

THE FOREIGN RULE

(Circa. 326 B. C.—1097 A. D.)

The decline and fall of the Vajjian Confederacy constitutes a land-mark in the history of ancient India. The political exit of the Licchavis from the north Indian stage ushered in a new era--the era of full-fledged imperialism. The republican forces having been subdued one by one, the interest and welfare of the entire clan were now subordinated to the ambition of a single monarch or conqueror. It was in the wake of this new force that the foundations of big empires began to be laid. Magadha, with Bimbisāra, and later his son Ajātaśatru, was first to mobilise its forces in this direction. This unprecedented change in the political set-up was a signal to the shape of things to come. The centre of political gravity, which had already shifted from Mithilā to Vaiśālī in the preceding age, shifted now to Pāṭaliputra, the citadel of the Magadhan empire. From this time onward Mithilā had to submit to the constant domination by different powers coming from other parts of India, for about a century and a half, till the advent of the Karṇāṭa king Nānyadeva, the founder of the Simarāon dynasty (1097 A. D.).

THE MAGADHANS

With the fall of the mighty Licchavis Ajātaśatru occupied Vaiśālī and became master of Tirhut. It is also

probable that he carried his victorious arms to the foot of the mountains and the whole country between the Gaṅgā and the Himālaya became subject direct to the suzerainty of Magadha. From this time also dates back the foundation of Pāṭaliputra as the victor had erected a fortress at the village of Pāṭali, on the bank of the Gaṅgā to curb his Licchavi opponents. The foundation of the city nestling under the shelter of the fortress was laid by his son (or grandson ?) Udaya or Udayin. Though shorn of her grandeur Vaiśālī, however, continued to be the centre of political as well as the religious life north of the Gaṅgā and commanded a great influence over the followers of Buddhism and Jainism. This is clear from the fact that in the following age Śiśunāga, Ajātaśatru's successor and " the destroyer of the glory of the Pradyotas," had a royal residence at Vaiśālī, which ultimately became his capital[1].

The Śaiśunāgas

Among Ajātaśatru's successors, except Udaya or Udayin, all were weaklings. Because of their parricidal deeds they were chased and banished by the people who anointed Śiśunāga, an amātya (probably the Magadhan viceroy at Banaras) as their king. Vaiśālī probably continued to be a secondary capital till the time of the Nandas, It is interesting to note that Śiśunāga was son of a Licchavi rājā of Vaiśālī. He was, according to Mahāvaṃśaṭīkā[2], conceived by a *nagara-śobhinī* and brought up

1. PHAI[6], 219; Annals, 1920-21, p. 3; SBE, XI, p. xvi.
2. Turnour, Mahāvaṃśaṭīkā, xxxvii.

by an officer of the State. Śiśunāga 'not unmindful of his mother's origin re-established the city of Vaiśālī and fixed in it the royal residence. From that time Rājagṛha lost her rank of royal city which she never afterwards recovered"[1]. This definitely shows that once again a scion of the Vajji clan wielded imperial power and ruled Vaiśālī, together with Pāṭaliputra. He also annihilated the power and prestige of the Pradyota dynasty of Avantī and thus established the supreme authority of the Magadhan empire.

Śiśunāga's son and successor Kākavarṇa or Kālāśoka also ruled over Pāṭaliputra and Vaiśālī. The holding of the second Buddhist Conference at Vaiśālī and the re-transfer of the capital to Pāṭaliputra are the two significant events of his time[2]. He was probably stabbed to death. Of his ten successors Nandidharmana was the most important. But, the Śiśunāgas owing to internal dissensions and intrigues were soon overthrown and supplanted by the Nanda Line.

THE NANDAS.

After the Haryaṅkas or Śaiśunagas Mahāpadma or Mahāpadmapati, i. e., "the sovereign of an infinite host" or "of immense wealth" was the first king of the Nanda line[3]. His origin is controversial and the Purāṇic and

1. PHAI6, 219-20.
2. Ibid, 222 ff.
3. Wilson, Viṣṇu P., Vol. IX, 184 n ; A city on the Gaṅgā, styled Mahāpadmapura is also mentioned in Mbh. XII. 353. 1 ; See also JBRS. XXXVIII, 177 ff.

Jaina evidences are divergent. The fact, however, remains that Mahāpadma was the most powerful king of his time. "The destroyer of all the Kṣatriyas" (*sarva Kṣatrāntaka*) and "sole monarch (*Ekarāṭ*) of the earth", he "finally overthrew all the dynasties which ruled contemporaneously with the Śiśunāgas, viz., the Ikṣvākus, Pañcālas, Kāśīs. Haihayas, Kaliṅgas, Aśmakas, Kurus, Maithilas, Śūrasenas, Vitihotras" etc[1]. The Maithilas, it seems, by this time occupied a small district (i. e., the modern Darbhanga District) to the north of the Vajjian dominion which had already been annexed to the Magadhan Empire by Ajātaśatru. Thus, a considerable portion of India was unified under Nanda's sceptre with Palibothra (according to the classical writers) or Pāṭaliputra as its capital.

Mahāpadma left behind a big empire, a large army and a full exchequer. According to Diodorus Gandaritai or Gandaridi ruled by Xandrames or Mahāpadma-Ugrasena was "the greatest of all nations of India"[2]. He was succeeded by his eight sons. Dhana Nanda was the last king of this line. His tyranny and "mean and wicked disposiition" was ultimately responsible for the fall of this line[3].

1. cf. DKA, 23, 69. The Jainas, too, allude to the wide dominion of Nanda (Vide-Pariśiṣṭa-parvan. VII. 81.) :

   "समुद्रवसनेशेभ्य आसमुद्रमपिश्रियः

   उपाय हस्तैराकृष्य ततः सोऽकृत नन्दसात्"

2. MacCrindle, The Invasion of India, 282 ; Sen, HAIB. 166-67.

3. MacCrindle. The Invasion of India, 222 ; cf. Reference to Nanda's avarice DKA, 125 ; Jaina Pariśiṣṭa-parvan. vi. 244—

   "ततश्च केचित् सामन्ता मदेनान्धः भविष्णवः

   नन्दस्य न नति चक्रुरसौ नापितसूरिति"

They were also involved in a struggle with the Mauryas. We have a detailed description of this bloody encounter that took place between the waning Nandas and the waxing Mauryas, which spelt the doom of the former[1].

THE MAURYAS.

"The rising new star, the most interesting factor in the older picture", Candragupta Maurya (c. 321 B. C.) belonged to a Kṣatriya clan. Like Śivājī he, too, organised a band of Indians and waged war against the powers within (i. e., Agrammes) and from without (i. e., the Macedonian hoardes). Having completed the overthrow of the Nandas he extended his supremacy "from the lord of mountains (the Himālaya), cooled by the showers of the spray of the divine stream (Gaṅgā) playing about among its rocks, to the shores of the Southern Ocean (Dakṣiṇārṇava) marked by the brilliant of gems flashing with various colours"[2]. Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra also refers to the subjugation of the whole of Northern India (Udicī) from the Himālaya to

1. The Purāṇic passage about this dynastic change stands as follows—

"उद्धरिष्यति तान् सर्वान् कौटिल्यो वै द्विजर्षभ:
कौटिल्यश्चन्द्रगुप्तं तु ततो राज्येभिषेक्ष्यति" (DKA. 26, 35).

The Kauṭilya Arthaśāstra, the Kāmandakīya Nītisāra, the Mudrārākṣasa, the Caṇḍa-Kauśika, the Ceylonese Chronicles, etc. also refer to this dynastic revolution.

For an account of the great struggle between the Nandas and the Mauryas, see Milinda-Pañho, IV. 8. 26; SBE. XXXVI, 147-48 ; IA. 1914, p 124 n.

2. Mudrārākṣasa, III, 19.

the sea by the first Maurya. His defeat of Seleukos (or Seleucus) and the matrimonial alliance with the latter made him practically the sole authority from Afghanistan across the continent eastward to Bengal, and from the Himālaya down to the Central Provinces[1].

From the Mauryan seals of the 3rd century B. C. discovered in the Basārh excavations (1913-14) it appears that Vaiśālī including Mithilā was like Saurāṣṭra, and other provinces of the Mauryan empire, under the governace of a Kṣatriya or the Imperial High Commissioner. We have no definite evidences relating to the form of government prevalent during those days in those parts of the Magadhan territory, though we have a reference to peoples who were autonomous, and cities which enjoyed democratic government. Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra also refers to a number of Saṃghas. This indicates that the Saṃgha form of government still existed, of course in theory, though it can safely be assumed that in practice, all these Saṃghas constituted the vassals of the Mauryan empire.

Bindusāra succeeded Candragupta in c. 300 B. C. He is known as Amitraghāṭa or Amitrakhāda, a Sanskrit restoration of the Amitrachates of Athenaios and Allitrochades of Strabo, which means "slayer of foes" or "devourer of enemies"[2]. Tāranātha's reference to "the

1. Rhys Davids, Buddhist India (1st. Ed.), pp. 260 ff.
2. cf. Weber, IA. II, p. 148 ; Lassen & Cunningham, Bhilsa Topes. 92 ; Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya III. 2. 2; Mbh. 30. 19 ; 62. 8 ; VII. 22. 16 ; CR. 1926. p. 399 ; Ait. Brā. VIII. 17 (amitrāṇāṃ hantā) ; Rv. X. 152. 1 ; JRAS. 1928, Jannary (Jarl Charpentier's article) ; Ibid. 1909. p. 24.

destruction of the nobles and sixteen towns" and his mastery over the "territory between the eastern and the western seas" does not bear any particular significance as all these conquests were already completed by Candragupta himself[1]. It can be said that Bindusāra well guarded the territories won by his father.

One of the most striking and interesting personalities in the history of the world Bindusāra's son, Aśoka dominated the political scene of India for about 40 years (269 B. C.—232 B. C.). The distribution of his inscriptions, pillars, rock-edicts etc. clearly shows that "all the centripetal forces that had been at work since the days of Bimbisāra" were triumphed, and with the conquest of Kaliṅga was completed "the unification of non-Tamil India under the hegemony of Magadha". The inscriptions near Kālsī and those on the Rummindeī and Nigāli Sāgar pillars and the monuments at Lalitapāṭan and Rāmapurvā prove that besides Dehra-dun district and the Tarāi Aśoka's empire included the valley of Nepal and the district of Campāran. From R. E. XIII[2] it is clear that the Himālaya region was within his empire. The same edict speaks of two vassal tribes Viśa and Vajrī[3]. Vajrī was probably identical with

1. PHAI[6], 297; EHI[8]., 149; JRAS. 1923, p. 96; JBORS. II, 79 ff.
2. Sircar, Select Inscriptions, Vol. I. It refers to the Nābhapaṃtis of Nābhaka, prabably identical with Na-pei-kea of Fa-hian (Legge, 64), the birth-place of Krakucchanda Buddha, about ten miles south-west of Kapilavastu (PHAI[6], 309, fn. 2).
3. More recent writers do not accept Buhler's reading and substitute (Rāja) **Visayambi**, 'in the (King's) territory,' in its place. "There is thus no indubitable reference either to the Vṛjikas or the 'Besatae' (of the Periplus ?) in the inscriptions of Aśoka. (cf. PHAI[6], 309).

the Vajji which, along with the Kambojas and other Saṃghas Kauṭilya refers to as Vrijika or Vṛjika Saṃgha. The Vrijikas, like Kambojas, were a vassal state within the Mauryan empire with Vaiśālī as their capital, where the Yuvarāja of the Imperial dynasty, like the Imperial Guptas, might have been posted.

Aśoka visited Vaiśālī (c. 250 B. C.) which lay on the road between Pāṭaliputra and Nepal. He erected a lion-pillar there, though he is said to have removed the sacred relics of Buddha. Nepal probably formed an integral part of the empire at that time, and was administered directly from the capital of Pāṭaliputra as one of the home provinces. The royal road to it from Pāṭaliputra appears to have led first to Vaiśālī and then passed through Keśariyā, Lauriya-Ararāja, Bettiah, Lauriya-Nandanagarh, Jānakīgarh and Rāmapurvā (where also there is a pillar near Pipariyā not far from Śikārapura in the Campāran district) entering the hills by the Bhikhnā Thorī pass[1], as his line of march is marked by a lion-pillar at Vaiśālī (Basārh), by a stūpa at Kesariyā and by the pillars of Lauriya-Ararāja near Govindaganj. Lauriya-Nandanagarh (15 miles north of Bettiah) and Rāmapurvā in the Campāran districts[2].

1. Singh, 56 ; also cf. PHAI[6], 309.
2. Rep. Arch. Surv. Ind. Vol. I., 1862-65, pp. 64-74. Keśariyā in Campāran district is supposed to be the spot where Buddha took leave of the Licchavis and where he presented his alms-bowl to them. It is believed that they erected a stūpa over the spot where the alms-bowl was presented by Buddha (Vide-Beal, Buddhist Records of the Western World, p. LII; Rep. Arch. Surv. Ind. XVI, North and South Bihar).

Lauriya-Nandanagarh is believed by some to be the site where the "Ashes Stūpa" was erected over the ashes taken from Buddha's funeral pyre. (Smith's article on Kuśīnarā or Kuśīnagrāma in JRAS. 1902 ; Singh, 44-45).

Seal No. 800 (Plate L) discovered in the Basārh excavations containing the inscription "*Vesālī-anusaṃyānaka-ṭakāra*"[1] is, according to Fleet, to be referred to Mauryan period. The word "Anusaṃyāna" means "a tour". It occurs in the third rock-edict where Aśoka directs certain of his officials "not to go on a tour every five years", but "to make a (complete) tour (throughout their charges) in (the course of) every five years. The reference is to the five years cycle by which the calender of the period was regulated. and to a system of periodical inscriptions." The line may mean "the touring office or officer of Vaiśālī".[2] Spooner takes the seal to be simply that of a local sub-station of the metropolitan police forces of Vaiśālī. and to have been affixed to some document sent in from Takāra (a place some-where in the near vicinity) to the headquarter-office in Vaiśālī[3]. It thus shows that in the time of Aśoka Vaiśālī constituted one of the most important headquarters of the Magadhan territories.

The Kaliṅga episode, however, marked the close of his career of conquest and aggrandisement and ushered in a new era—the era of peace, social progress and of religious propaganda. The great killer turned into a great healer. He sent his missionaries abroad to preach and diffuse the Buddhist doctrines. Vaiśālī, the citadel of Buddhists, must have gained momentum. According to some writers the Buddhist priests from Magadha and

1. Arch. Surv. Ind. Ann. Rep, 1913-14.
2. Ibid, 111-12; JRAS. 1908, p. 821.
3. Ibid, 112.

Tirhut went in large numbers to preach their religion to Tibet during Aśoka's time[1]. Nonetheless, the Maithilas seem to have been adamant in their anti-Buddhistic attitude, for we know that one of the causes leading to the downfall and break-up of the Mauryan Empire was the violent Brāhmaṇic reaction. Roy Choudhury does not subscribe to this view[2]. The following period, however, saw the recrudescence of Brāhmaṇic learning and culture. It is, therefore, probable that this must have partly, if not solely, contributed to the disintegration of the Mauryan Empire.

Aśoka's death (232 B. C.) gave an impetus to the pent-up forces to rise their heads. With the "*bherīghoṣa*" no longer heard, and the martial ardour gone, his successors proved too inefficient to arrest the process of disruption. The policy of non-violence had its disastrous vengeance. Lack of foresightedness, efficiency and integrity on the part of his weak successors had already turned the mighty empire into "a shrivelled and attenuated carcase", which was finally buried deep down by the Brāhmaṇa Puṣyamitra's *coup d'etat* of c. 187 B. C.[3]

The Śuṅgas

With the exit of the Mauryas a single political authority to be "obeyed from the snowy heights of the Hindu kuśa to the verdant plains of Bengal and upper Carnatic"[4]

1. JBRS. XXXVIII, 351-52.
2. PHAI[6] 354-61.
3. Ibid. 364 & fn. 2.
4. Ibid. 368.

was now a thing of the past. The entire country was thrown in doldrums. Indian history for the time being lost its unity. In the south the indomitable Āndhra-Śātavāhanas began recording their glorious history with the sharp edge of their sword ; in the east Khāravela, the king of Kaliṅga had already established his kingdom and revenged his past defeat at the hands of the Nanda and Aśoka by twice uprooting their successors. In the north-west the glory of the Mauryas was utterly dimmed. The Indian scene was left without a Candragupta to hit back on a Seleucus, a Porus to resist the advancing forces of an Alexander, or an Aśoka to bring the greater part of the country "under one umbrella." Brāhmaṇism replaced Buddhism. The Brāhmaṇas exchanged "the ferule for the sword" The finale came when Bṛhadratha, the last Mauryan king, was assassinated by his general Puṣyamitra, and the vigorous Bimbikas or the Śuṅgas entered the stage (C. 184 B. C). This Puṣyamitra Śuṅga belonged to the well-known family of Bhāradvājas[1]. His dominions stretched as far as the Narmadā, including the cities of Pāṭaliputra, Ayodhyā, Vidiśā, etc.[2]. The Emperor himself continued to reside in Pāṭaliputra[3]. The Himālayan regions including Mithilā and Vaiśālī, besides the whole of North-Eastern India, remained under the aegis of Pāṭaliputra under the direct supervision of the king himself. This is probable in view of the fact that while we have records of other provincial chiefs severing their relation with the

1. Aśvalāyana Srauta Sūtra, XII, 13. 5; VI. Vol. II, p. 125; PHAI[6], 369-70; See also JBRS. XLI. 132-39.
2. Ibid. 371 ; JBRS. 1949, pp. 47-48, 55.
3. Divyāvadāna, 434.

Central authority, we have no such evidences in the case of these states. It must have been too difficult for them to shake off the yoke of dependence, being much nearer the centre or the Metropolis. Moreover, three terracottas[1] discovered among the finds in the Basarh excavations have been assigned to the Śuṅga or the Mauryan period and other three fragments of certainly Śuṅgan (possibly Mauryan date) were also found by Sir John Marshall. This clearly confirms the domination of the Vaiśālī region by the Śuṅgas, though we have no information about the administrative set-up there.

Of all, the Brāhmaṇas of Mithilā must have welcomed the advent of a Brāhmaṇic power, as the Śuṅgas ardently championed their cause. The history of this Brāhmaṇa ruler is full of bloodsheds. He started his reign with blood and to a great extent, ended his career with blood. A champion of militant Brāhmaṇism he revived and re-established the ancient priestly traditions by holding two Aśvamedha sacrifices[2]. In the Mālavikāgnimitram he is described as "king" or "emperor". In his time the Greeks again aspired after the conquest of East. But, Magadha stood once more in their way. Wrangling swords were unseathed, steel crossed steel and the East clashed with the West. The "verdict of Hydespes" was reversed once more. In Puṣyamitra the Greeks, to their bitter memories, met with another Candragupta Maurya[3].

1. Arch. Surv. Ind. Ann. Rep. 1913-14, Nos. 532, 550 & 569, Pls. XLIII-LIV.
2. PHAI[6], 388-89.
3. For details, see PHAI[6], 378-88.

Puṣyamitra ruled from c. 187 to 151 B. C.[1] His successors Agnimitra and Vasumitra successfully maintained their control over the territories, but we have no particular references to the regions under review. The last king Devabhūti was tragically killed by his amātya Vāsudeva, who brought about the fall of this dynasty (75 B. C.)[2].

The Kāṇvas

The Kāṇva or Kāṇvāyana dynasty came to be founded in 75 B. C. According to R. G. Bhandarkar "the founder of the Āndhra-bhṛtyas is said to have uprooted not only the Kāṇvas but whatever was left of the power of the Śuṅgas"[3]. They are pointedly spoken of as Śuṅga-bhṛtyas or 'the servants of the Śuṅgas". It thus appears likely that when the princes of the Śuṅga family became weak, the Kāṇvas usurped power and ruled like the Peshwas, not uprooting the dynasty of their masters but reducing them to the character of nominal sovereigns.

Little is known about the activities of the Kāṇvas and also the history of Magadha and the adjoining countries during the period, and after. Their rule was short-lived and they were soon swept off their feet by the so-called Āndhras or Śātavāhanas. "The only rulers of note in the centuries immediately preceding the Christian era whom we know from epigraphic evidence, to have ruled in

1. Ibid. 378.
2. Ibid. 395-96
3. Early History of the Deccan, Quoted in PHAI[5], 332-33.

Magadha and the neighbouring provinces, are the so-called Mitras".[1] The Jaina literature also confirms the prevalence of Mitra-rule[2]. The relationship between the Mitras and the Śuṅgas or Kāṇvas is not known, The 'Mitras' were replaced by the Scythian Muruṇḍas and Satraps in Pāṭaliputra as well as in Mathurā. They, in their turn, were eventually ousted and supplanted by the Nāgas and the Guptas.

THE ĀNDHRAS.

Some scholars doubt the Āndhra rule over Magadha. The statements contained in the Purāṇas record that "the Āndhra Śimuka will assail the Kāṇvāyanas and Suśarman, and destroy the remains of the Śuṅgas' power and will obtain this 'earth'"[3]. Bhandarkar believes that Śimuka flourished in the 1st century B.C. and ruled over Magadha.[4] The Āndhras may have controlled the kingdom of Magadha for a time. Nāsik praśasti of Gautamīputra Śātakarṇī refers to the king as a "Brāhmaṇa ruler" and "*Khatiya-dapa-māna-madan*," i. e., the destroyer of the pride and conceit of the Kṣatriyas[5]. The Nānāghāṭ inscriptions[6] speak of Śātakarṇī, son (?) of Śimuka, as performing sacrifices, making extensive conquest and

1. PHAI[6], 401.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid, 403.
4. Ibid, fn. 2.; for details see 403 ff.
5. EI. VIII, 60-61. See also IC I, 513 ff; EI. XXII. 32 ff; PHAI[6], 413, fn. 4.
6. ASI. 1923-24, p 88.

raising the Śātavāhanas to the paramount position rivalling in "extent and power of the Śuṅga empire in the Ganges Valley". The Śātavāhanas apart, Khāravela of Kaliṅga (Cedī or Ceti) carried his arms to Northern India and humbled the king of Rājagṛha in the 1st century B.C. The Hāthīgumphā inscription[1] says that in the eighth year of his reign Khāravela stormed Goratha-giri and harassed Rājagṛha. Again in the tenth year and certainly in the 12th year he repeated his attack on Northern India. He is also said to have overrun Bhāratavarṣa, probably upper India. In the 12th year he claims to have harassed the kings of Uttarāpatha and watered his elephants in the Gaṅgā (Sugaṃgīya?)[2] and subjugated Magadha and Aṅga. Beyond this we have no information. But it seems that Pāṭaliputra and the adjoining territories (Tirhut etc.) were subordinated by him. The rulers of North-Eastern India probably ruled as vassal kings and paid tributes to the Kaliṅga emperor.

THE PARTHIANS.

From the 1st century B. C. to the rise of the Kuśānas, particularly Kaniṣka (78 A. D.), the history of Magadha and that of N. E. India are shrouded in obscurity. Every fabric of the Empire seems to have been shattered. Similarly in the north-west the Greek power was hastening towards dissolution, because of the constant family feuds between the House of Euthydemos and Demetrious on the

1. EI. XX. 79 ff.
2. Ibid. 88.

one hand and that of Ekratides on the other[1]. The Yavanas were soon followed by the Parthians, and the Parthians by the Śakas, *i.e.*, Damijada and Maues, whose dates range from B. C. 135 to A. D. 154. Scholars identify Maues with Mahārāja Moga of the so-called Sirsukh or Taxila plate dated in the year 78 of an unspecified era. The generally accepted view is that the era is of Śaka institution. 'As the era is used only in Northern India, and the borderland, it is permissible to conjecture that it came into existence after the Śaka occupation of those regions". The era we may further add, is still extant in Mithilā and the neighbouring tract, alongside the Vikrama Era. But, the successors of Maues, Azes, Azilises etc. were more or less confined to the Panjab, and they had probably very little or nothing to do with the politics of Northern India[2].

With the advent of the Kuśānas on the Indian scene there broke out a struggle for power between the Indo-Parthians and the Kuśānas, in which the former were overthrown and destroyed.

The Kuśānas

The first notable representative of the Kuśānas was Wima Kadphises. But the most important king of the line was Kaniṣka during whose time the Kuśānas enjoyed the mastery of wide dominion including Banaras, Mathurā, Kosala (Sāhet-māhet) and probably Pāṭaliputra. Kaniṣka founded an era (the dates ranging probably from the year 1 to 99) and completed the Kuśāna conquest of upper

1. PHAI[6], 425 ff.
2. PHAI[5], 437.

India. Traditions relating to his conflict with the rulers of Soked (Sāketa) and Pāṭaliputra in Eastern India are preserved by Tibetan and Chinese writers[1]. According to these writers, the Yueh-chi king attacked Magadha to get hold of the Buddhist scholar whose home was in Sāketa. The Śrīdharmapiṭakanidānasūtra records that Kaniṣka (*chen-t'an kia-ni-ch'a*) defeated the king of Pāṭaliputra and accepted Aśvaghoṣa as indemnity.[2] The Chinese translation of Kumāralatā's Kalpanāmaṇḍitīkā says that *Kia-ni-ch'a* took possession of T'ien-chu (Eastern India) and established peace in the country.[3] During the excavations at Belwā in the Saran district of the Tirhut division the late H. Pandey found some punch-marked copper coated with silver coins, belonging to the Kuśāna dynasty, which show that Tirhut was once dominated by the Kuśānas.[4] Again, during the excavations at Basārh (1913–14)

1. EI. XIV. 142 ; IA. 1903, p. 382 ; CII. Vol. II, pp. lxxii & lxxv ; PHAI[6]. 473 ff.
2. IA. VIII, 475 ff ; XXXII, 387 ; CII. Vol. II, p. Lxxix. For the legend about Kaniṣka and Aśvaghoṣa see a recent article by H. W. Bailey in JRAS 1942, pt I ; For Majumdar's identification of king Candra of the Meharauli Pillar Inscription with Kaniṣka, see JRASB. IX, 1943, No. 1. pp. 179-83.
3. CII. Vol. II. p. lxxv & n. 4.
4. Allan, Coins of Ancient India. Int. xlviii ff.

   D. R. Regmi says : " The Licchavis had probably migrated in to the valley during the early years of Kuśāna rule out of fear of invasions and had found easy shelter there on account of the withdrawal of the Suṅgas who had to give in to the Kuśānas. But they were persued even in the fastness of the sub-Himālayan region and......had to surrender the valley as well." Moreover, coins of Kadphises I and II.

Spooner found some coins of Kaniṣka type, apart from punch-marked, cast and other coins of other rulers, a distinct coin of Kadphises II,[1] which "mark the most easterly point in the distribution of this prince's coinage" and show that Kaniṣka's reign had already extended as far as Tirhut and its neighburing tracts.

A gold coin of the "Juviṣka Type" was discovered in 1914 at Belvadag Thānā, and later a copper-coin of Kaniṣka in the Karrā, both situated in the Ranchi district of Bihar[2]. The Ratan Tata's excavation at Patna (site No. 1) yielded two copper coins of Kaniṣka of the "Vāyu Type"[3]. In the Pāṭaliputra excavations at Kumrahār 3 coins of Wima Kadphises, 12 of Kaniṣka, and 30 of Huviṣka were found.[4] There is also a Buddhist image at Gaya bearing an inscription probably dated in the reign of Huviṣka. Thus, Kuśāna rule appears to have extended over Bihar from the time of Kaniṣka to that of Huviṣka[5].

The recent discovery of a large hoard of Kuśāna coins at Buxar is of great interest. These Kuśāna coins "were quite common in Bihar, not only down to the end of the reign of Huviṣka but even for about fifty years more." Altekar suggests that, as the Kuśāna copper coins are not

dug out in the valley, probably prove that these two Kuśāna emperors had Nepal under their control." (Vide—Ancient and Medieval Nepal, p. 49).

1. Smith, Catalogue of the Coins in the Indian Museum, Calcutta, Fig. 7 of Pl. XI.
2. JBORS. I, pp. 231-32 ; V, p. 78 and n. 2 ; III, p. 174.
3. ASI. 1912-13, pp. 79, 84-85.
4. JNSI. XII. 122.
5. JBORS. 1920, p. 22 ; Also cf. Aiyangar, Ancient India, 18.

known to have travelled to Central or Western India by trade, and "if, therefore, they are found to be fairly numerous at Vaiśālī and Pāṭaliputra, if a hoard almost exclusively consisting of them, is found in Buxar consisting of coins extremely worn-out, the conclusion seems to be irresistible that Magadha was conquered by the Kuśānas early in their dynastic history"[1] It was also from Vaiśālī that Kaniṣka carried off the famous alms-bowls of Buddha about or in the 1st. century A. D.[2]. The Kuśāna king who conquered Northern India, was probably Wima Kadphises, a fact also corroborated by the Chinese sources.[3] Eastern India was probably broken into new administrative units, over which there were originally Viceroys ruling under their Kuśāna suzerains. They took the earliest opportunity of carving out independent principalities with the decline of the supremacy of their masters[4]. The Śakas of Ujjain also broke away from the Kuśānas, and made their inroad into the Vaiśālian territory. Of the large number of seals discovered in the Basārh excavations[5] seal No. 248 bearing as device a bull, facing, standing in the centre with the legend in a continuous circle around the edge is of particular significance. The legend runs as follows :—

" *Rājño Mahākṣatrapasya Svāmi—Rudrasiṃhasya duhitu Rājño Mahākṣatrapasya Svāmi Rudrasenasya*

1. JNSI. XII. 122.
2. Rep. Arch Surv. Ind. XVI, 8-11 ; JRAS. 1913, pp. 627-50 ; 1914, pp. 79-88, 369-82, 403-10, 748-51 ; 1915, pp. 95-108.
3. JNSI. XII.122-23.
4. Sen, HAIB. 198
5. Arch. Surv. Ind. Ann. Rep. 1913-14.

bhaginyā Mahādevyā Prabhudamāyā (h)", *i.e.*, " the seal of the great queen Prabhudamā, sister of the king, the Mahākṣatrapa Svāmī Rudrasiṃha." This and some terracotta plaques, of which one bears a winged human figure indicating foreign influence, clearly show that at one time the place (i. e., Vaiśālī or Tirhut) must have been under Rudrasena I, the son of Rudrasiṃha, the Mahākṣatrapa of Ujjain.

The Nāgas & the Vākāṭakas

After the dissolution of the Kuśāna empire, it appears that a member of the clan of Baukhara Rājaputs, patronised by Kaniṣka, rose to certain pre-eminence among the rulers of India in the 3rd cent. A. D. Endowed with great power, and originally a ruler of Magadha, he is said to have exercised a great sort of imperial suzerainty[1]. But of his hold over Mithilā and other adjoining regions we have no definite account. With the extinction of the Kuśāna and the Āndhra empires the country split up into a number of independent states, ruled by princes of different families, native and foreign, which fought among themselves for power and supremacy.

Jayaswal believes that in the period, intervening the decline of the Kuśānas and the rise of the Guptas, two kingdoms of distinctions arose—(*i*) the Nāga Kingdom, and (*ii*) the Vākāṭaka kingdom. Out of the two the Nāgas or the Bhāraśivas built up their Bhārava empire on the ruins of the Kuśānas. Emerging from the areas now

1. HAIB. 199.

known as Bundelakhaṇḍa (or Padmāvatī near Narawar in Gwalior) they established a semi-imperial authority in North India[1]. In about the beginning of the 3rd century A. D. these Nāga rulers are officially described as having performed ten Aśvamedha or horse-sacrifices, the traditional ceremony of Imperial authority, probably to commemorate their conquest of the Gangetic Valley after the expulsion of the Kuśānas. Brāhmaṇism, therefore, must have gained in tremendous power and popularity by this time.

Vīrasena was the greatest ruler of the line who is represented as having uprooted the Kuśānas from the Madhyadeśa and Eastern U. P. Bhavanāga (c. 305-340 A. D.) their last king, contracted matrimonial alliances with the Brāhmaṇa Vākāṭaka king, the son of Pravarasena. This alliance was considered to be so significant that it has been recorded in almost all the inscriptions of the Vākāṭaka rulers[2]. Though we have general references to their authority over North India, we have no tangible evidences pointing to their rule over the regions under review. It is probable that like the later Licchavis they merged with the rising Vākāṭaka power through matrimonial alliances.

The Vākāṭaks flourished a little before the advent of the Guptas (c. 248 A. D.) in the region between Bundelakhaṇḍa and Kṛṣṇā. Pravarasena I is said to have assumed

1. JBORS. 1933 (March-June), p. 3 ff ; Upādhyāya, Prācīna Bhārata kā Itihāsa (Hindi), 225 ff. For the different theories of their disputed origin, cf. JNSI. Vol. V, 21-22 ; NHI. (Altekar-Majumdar). VI, pp. 30 40 ; PHAI[6], 480 ff.

2. CII. Vol. III, 237 ff.

Imperial titles and his authority was probably well established over Hindusthan[1]. He performed four Aśvamedha sacrifices, besides Vājasapeya, Bṛhaspatisāra, etc. We have a detailed list of the conquest of his successors, viz., Rudrasena I, Pṛthvīsena, and Rudrasena II. But no particular reference to the regions of North-Eastern India is found therein[2]. Even though they conquered these territories, it appears, they could not establish their direct suzerainty, and were confined to the only areas whence they had emerged.

Some scholars believe that the later Vākāṭaka power witnessed the revival of the Licchavi power. The breakdown of the Imperial authority in Pāṭaliputra released the republic of its obligations to the paramount power and the Licchavis continued to grow in strength within their own territories. Their occupation of Pāṭaliputra for a time may prove to be a correct guess[3]. Their matrimonial alliances with the Guptas and their contributions to the growth of the Gupta power are well known. They were, later on absorbed into the Gupta empire, for we do not find any reference, whatsoever, to their existence as an independent power in the Gupta period, or after.

THE GUPTAS.

With the foundation of the Gupta Empire in 319-20 A. D. "the history of Northern India once again attained

1. JRAS. 1914, pp. 317 ff; JIH. 1935, pp. 1-26, 165-205; PHAI[6], 541-42; NHI. VI. Chap. V. etc.
2. Ibid, VI. 123-25.
3. Kielhorn's North Indian Inscription, No. 541 suggests some connection between the Licchavis and Puṣpapura (Pāṭaliputra).

the unity which it had lost in the creation of interminable principalities during the preceding age". Candragupta I's rule seems to have been confined, according to the Purāṇic statement, only to Magadha (South Bihar), Prayāga (Allahabad), and Sāketa (Oudh)[1]. Thus the Purāṇic statement does not include Vaiśālī (North Bihar) in the list of the possessions of Candragupta I. Allan's view that Vaiśālī was one of Candragupta's earliest conquests is, therefore, untenable. Nor does Vaiśālī occur in the list of Samudragupta's acquisitions, though the reference to Nepal as a border-state in the famous Allahabad Praśasti may suggest that "North Bihar was included within his dominions".[2] Samudragupta, the "*Sarvva-rājocchettā*" (exterminator of all kings), nodoubt, completed the conquest of the whole of India. But his only permanent annexation was the portion of Āryāvarta in the Upper Valley of the Gaṅgā and its tributories, together with certain districts in Central and Eastern India. Towards the South he followed the Kauṭilyan ideal of a "Dharmavijayī" or "righteous conqueror".

Vaiśālī first appears definitely as a Gupta possession in the time of Candragupta II. It constituted a viceroyalty

1. PHAI[6], 531 :

"अनु-गंगा-प्रयागंच साकेतम् मगधांस्तथा
एतान् जनपदान् सर्वान् भोक्ष्यन्ते गुप्तवंशजा:"

("Kings born of the Gupta family will enjoy all these territories viz., Prayāga, (Allahabad on the Gaṅges,) Sāketa(Oudh) and Magadha (South Bihar)". Also cf. "अनु-गंगं हास्तिनपुरम्, अनु-गंगं वाराणसी अनु-शोणम् पाटलिपुत्रम् "—Patañjali, II. 1. 2.

Allan suggests that Pāṭaliputra was in the possession of the Guptas even in Srī Gupta's time (Vide-PHAI[6], 531.)

2. PHAI[6], 531,

under an imperial Prince.[1] During his time Tīrabhukti formed one of the several *bhuktis*[2] i. e., Puṇḍravardhana bhukti (N. Bengal); Nagara-bhukti (South Bihar); Śrāvastī-bhukti (Oudh), and Ahicchātra-bhukti (Rohilakhaṇḍa), all situated in the Gaṅgā Valley. Vaiśālī was at that time much more powerful than the family of petty chiefs. It very likely formed the headquarters of one of the districts of the Gupta Empire, evidently of Tīrabhukti (***Tīra**bhuktau Vaiśālī Tārā*, i. e., the Tārā of Vaiśālī in Tīrabhukti). The seals of officials found in the Basārh excavations of 1903--04 probably attached to letters addressed by imperial officers to the Governors or chiefs of that district, ie., a city-magistrate, residing at Vaiśālī[3]. Among them we have one seal of Ghaṭotkacagupta[4]. The variety and characters of the seals in this find seem to justify Bhandarkar's suggetion that they were the caste-preserves in the workshop of the potter who was the general manufacturer of seals for the locality.

The Basārh seals also throw some interesting side light on the provincial and municipal government as well as the economic organisation of the province of Tīrabhukti. The province was governed by Prince Govindagupta, a son of emperor Candragupta II by Mahādevī Dhruvasvāminī[5]. He had his headquarters at Vaiśālī. Aiyangar suggests that Kumārgupta, who was probably the Viceroy,

1. Ibid. 531.
2. Ibid. 560; Also cf. Dikshitar, Gupta Polity, 246-52
3. Arch. Surv. Ind. Ann. Rep. 1903-04, pp. 88 ff.
4. Seal No. 2 : "श्रीघटोत्कचगुप्तस्य"
5. Seal No 1 : "महाराजाधिराज श्रीचन्द्रगुप्तपत्नी महादेवी श्रीध्रुवस्वामिनी"

was detained at headquarters and his brother Govinda gupta carried on the administration in his name.[1]

The seals discovered in the excavations of 1903-04 and 1913-14 by Bloch and Spooner respectively mention several officials,---*Uparika* (Governer); the *Kamāra-amātpa* (Cadet-minister); the *Mahā pratihāra* (the great Chamberlain); *Talavara* (General or local chief); the *Mahā-daṇḍanāyaka* (the great commandant); the *Vinayasthitisthāpaka* (the censor ?)[2] and the *Bhaṭāśvapati* (Lord of the army and Cavalry).

Besides the above, we have mention of the following offices—*Yuvarāja-pādīya Kumāra-amātya-adhikaraṇa* (office of the Minister of His Highness to the Crown-Prince); *Raṇabhāṇḍāgāra-adhikaraṇa* (office of the Chief Treasurer of the War Department)[3] *Balādhikaraṇa* (War-Office); *Daṇḍapāśādhikaraṇa* (office of the Governer of Tirhut); *Tīrabhuktau Vinayasthiti-sthāpaka-adhikaraṇa* (office of the Censor [?] of Tirhut)[4]; *Vaiśāly-ādhiṣṭhānādhikaraṇa* (office of the Government of the city of Vaiśālī,; *śrī-paramabhaṭṭāraka-pādīya Kumārāmātya-adhikaraṇa* (office of the Cadet-minister waiting on His Majesty). This office

1. Ancient India, 285; Also cf. V. R. R Dikshitar, Gupta Polity, 69.

   Bhukti Probably corresponded to a Commissioner's division of today(Vide-Dikshitar, Gupta Polity, 242).
2. R. G. Basak takes **Vinayasthiti** in the sense of law and order (Vide--The History of North-Eastern India, 312).
3. Ray Chaudhuri suggests that the Finance Department had its military as distinguished from the Civil side (Vide-- PHAI[6], 563, fn.)[4]
4. According to Ray Chaudhuri (PHAI[6], 563). But, according to Spooner, it looks as if it came from an officer whose functions were similar to those of Aśoka's Dharma-Mahāmatras.

according to Ray Chaudhuri, indicates a clear distinction between the imperial officials and those connected with Viceregal administration. Amongst the latter, however, the officials of the province of Tīrabhukti are clearly distinguished from the public servants incharge of the subordinate administration of the *adhiṣṭhāna* of Vaiśālī[1].

The reference to the Pariṣad (Council or Committee) of Udānakūpa shows that it still formed an important element of the machinery of the local Government.[2] The mention of the "moot-hall of adermen of guilds, caravan-leaders, and foremen of artisans,"[3] certain names of *Kulikas* etc. show that Vaisāli, besides being a seat of administration, was also an important centre of business and industry. Seals were issued by three classes of its guilds, viz., Nigamas or Śreṇīs; those of Bankers (Śreṣṭhin), Traders (Sārthavāha), and artisans (Kulika)[4] These seals very often refer to guilds of bankers. Thus, "banking was evidently as prominent in Vaiśālī as we should have expected it to be, judging from the notice in Manu to the effect that the people in Magadha were bards and

1. PHAI[6], 563, fn. 5; Also see Dikshitar, Gupta Polity, 152-63.
2. Ibid. 563.
3. Ibid.
4. "श्रेष्ठी-सार्थवाह-कुलिक-निगम," ie., "the corporation of bankers. traders and merchants" (Vide—ASIAR. 1903-04, pp. 112-18). In the inscriptions the term used to denote a guild were nigama, śreṇi, and nikāya, and the place where they usually met was called the nigama-sabhā which may be compared to guild-halls of modern Europe (Vide—R. D. Banerji, The Age of the Imperial Guptas, 83-85).

traders."[1] Each of these guilds had its President or *Prathama*. The inscriptions on the seals point to the existence of the Federations of Guilds; of guids of *śreṣṭhi-kulika nigama*. The large number of seals attached to letters sent by merchants and bankers speak of considerable commercial transactions that were conducted in those days between the Chiefs of Vaisālī and important traders from Paṭaliputra, Videha and other cities.

After Candragupta II, Kumāragupta, and his successors Purugupta and Skandagupta controlled the regions intact[2], though all of them had to bear the brunt of the ferocious Hūṇa invasions.[3] The uprooters of the mighty empire of the Romans and their civilisations, the Hūṇas however, failed to distroy India because of the organised power of the Guptas. India was thus saved from the fate of the Roman Empire and Pāṭaligupta that of Rome.

Tne death of Skandagupta (c. 467 A. D.) saw the mighty empire crumbling away almost before the eyes of

1. D. B. Spooner. ASIAR. 1913-14. p. 122; Also cf. Dikshitar, Gupta Polity, 270 ff.

   The legend of another seal at Bhita is as interesting as that of Vaiśālī or Tīrabhukti. Here the term **Kulika,** according to Spooner, stands for the expression "bankers" (Vide—ASIAR. 1913-14, p 108.). Sometimes personal seal-impressions like **prathama kulikas** in Bengal were also discovered at Vaiśālī. These various guilds of bankers, merchants, and traders, besides a number of other guilds pertaining to their profession, participated in the administration of the town and went a long way to make it a sucess. (Vide—Gupta Polity. 268-71).
2. ef. DKM., 53., 41-44.
3. JABS. 1921 (N. S.), 253 ff; also cf Bihar Stone Pillar Inscription of Skandagupta (Vide—Sircar, Select Inscriptions Vol. I, p. 316; CII. Vol. III, p. 47).

the existing generation, due to troubles both internal and external. This led to the growth of a class of hereditary Governors and other officials who commanded enormous influence in local centres and assumed the titles of Mahārāja and Mahārājādhirāja.[1] After Kumāragupta II Kramāditya (A. D. 473-74),[2] of the Sāranātha inscription, came Buddhagupta, who is referred to as having reigned over "the earth", in the two dated identical votive inscriptions from Sāranātha (*Guptānām Samatikkrānte Sapta-Pañcāśad-Uttare śate Samānām pṛthvīm Budhagupte praśasti.*)[3] He ruled over a fairly extensive empire which is proved by the find-spots of his inscriptions, seal, and coins. The Puṇḍravardhana bhukti in the time of Budhagupta probably "extended up to the Himālayas in the North, and might have included Nepal where is situated Varāhakṣetra[4], which has been identified with Kokāmukhasvāmī tīrtha."[5] His successors Narasiṃhagupta.[6] Vainyagupta (506 A. D.),[7] Kumāragupta III,[8] Bhānugupta and others proved weaklings and the history of the Gupta Empire virtually closed with the death of Budhagupta, "probably

1. PHAI6, 627.
2. DKM, 64, 69-70, ASIAR, 1914-15, p. 123.
3. ASIAR. 1914-15, pp. 124-25; Sircar, Select Inscriptions, Vol. I, pp 320-323; NHI. VI,p 189.
4. IHQ. XXI, 56ff; According to Dr. Laksman Jha, this Varahakṣetra is situated between Cataragaddī on the eastern bank of the Kośī and the Triveṇī rivers in the Himalaya. (Vide—JBRS. XXXVII. 125-26),
5. DKM. 76ff.
6. Ibid. 85-86.
7. Ibid. 96 ff.
8. Ibid, 113 ff.

the last king of the family to be implicitly obeyed on the banks of the lower Gaṅges as well as the Narmadā". The Imperial line finally collapsed in 551 A. D.[1]

Yaśodharman

For about a century we know nothing about the history or activities of this family. It is sometime about 530 A. D. that "Yaśodharman appears as a meteor in the political horizon ; carries his victorious arms far and wide, and sets a big empire. Like a meteor again, he suddenly vanishes and his empire perishes with him". By 532-33 A. D. he seems to have attained the height of his glory, "when his feet were worshipped (*arcitam pādayugmam*) by Mihirakula (*Mihirakula nṛpeṇa*) and his empire including countries, not enjoyed either by the Lords of the Gupta or the Chiefs of the Hūṇas (*ye bhuktā Guptanāthair-nna* . *rnnājñā Hūṇādhipānāṃ* . . *yan prāviṣṭā*), extended from the neighbourhood of the Brahmaputra to the Western Ocean and from the Himālayas to Mt. Mahendra in the South-East."[2] Such a general convention, according to Majumdar, cannot of course be taken at its face-value, and on the basis of this record alone we shall be hardly justified in regarding him as the "sole monarch of Northern India".[3] But the way he accomplished his conquests at the expense of the Hūṇas and the Guptas, amply attests that he ruled over a considerable, if not entire, portion of

1. cf. PHAI[6], 481-98.
2. CII. Vol. III. Nos. 30, 33 & 35, pp. 142-58.
3. NHI. VI, 203.

Northern India including Magadha, Mithilā and the territories upto the Himālaya[1]. But his brilliant successes were ephemeral and he failed to produce any permanent result for in a land-grant dated 543 A. D., ten years after the Mandaśor inscription, in North Bengal, the son (?) and Viceroy of a " Gupta-parama-bhaṭṭāraka mahārājādhirāja pṛthvīpati, ie. Supreme Sovereign, King of kings, Lord of the Earth", and not Yaśodharman or any of his official of Central India, is invoked as suzerain.[2] The bond, hitherto knitting together, though loosely, the vast dominions from the Bay of Bengal to the Arabian Sea, "was cut by the cruel sword, not of the Hūṇa chiefs, but of the ambitious Yaśodharman, and he was probably the first victim to perish in the resulting chaos and confusion"[3].

THE LATER GUPTAS

From the Aphaṣād inscription[4] we know that the later Guptas rose to prominence about the same time as did the Maukharīs. Amidst the convulsions following the Imperial Guptas, the later Guptas, no doubt, tried to revive their lost glories but what they achieved was only the ghost of their former existence as the process of disintegration had gone too far.[5] The waxing

1. DKM., 117-20.
2. PHAI[6], 598.
3. NHI, VI, 204-05.
4. CII. III. No. 42.
5. For the limits of the reign of Viṣṇugupta Candrāditya, the successor of Kumāragupta III, who " like Shah Alam II was an eye-witness to slow death of the Empire", see DKM, 127-29.

Maukharīs were also at this time bidding for supremacy in the north. The later Guptas in the 7th. century A. D. were originally connected with the Province of Bihar, for almost all their extant inscriptions have been found in Bihar (Patna and Shahabad districts), except the one recovered from Bengal. Jīvitagupta[1] is described as "*Kṣitīśa-cūḍāmaṇi*", *i.e.*, 'the Overlord of the Earth."[2] Probably he succeeded in rehabilitating the power and prestige of his family in the territories lying between the Himālaya and the sea, through several compaigns. "The very terrible scorching fever (of fear) left not (his) haughty foes, even though they stood on sea-side shores that were cool with the flowing and ebbing currents of water, (and) were covered with the branches of plantain trees severed by the trunks of elephants roaming through the lofty groves of palmyra palms ; (or) even though they stood on (that) mountain (Himālaya) which is cold with the water of the rushing and waving torrents full of snow." The "haughty foes" on sea-side shores were probably the Gauḍas who had already launched into a career of conquest about this time.[3] It cannot, however, be definitely said whether he undertook these campaigns as a feudatory in the name of the Emperor or as an inde-

1. His predecessors Kṛṣṇagupta and Srī Harṣagupta proved comparatively weaker kings (Vide—DKM. 159-59 ; PHAI[6], 601.)
2. CII. Vol. III, p. 200.
3. PHAI[6], 601-02 ; EI. XIV, 110 et seq (the Harahā Inscription of Iśānavarman).

pendent king[1]. His son, Kumāragupta, it seems, had assumed an independent status.

Then, the contest for overlordship ensued, between the later Guptas, *viz.*, Jīvitagupta, Kumāragupta, and Dāmodaragupta and the Maukharīs, *viz.*, Iśānavarman and Sarvavarman. "It was a struggle between the waning glories of Magadha and the rising power of Kanauj." Meanwhile the Gauḍas, the Sulikas, the Āndhras and the Cālukyas were sharply rising to power. The Mahākūṭa pillar inscription states that in the 6th century A. D. Kirttivarman I of the "Cālikya" dynasty gained victories over the kings of Vaṅga, Aṅga, Magadha, etc. Kumāragupta and Dāmodaragupta had thus to encounter a sea of troubles[2]. Though they survived the catastrophe, their successors (Mahāsenagupta and others) were ousted from Magadha and their possessions were now considerably diminished by the loss of Bihar.[3]

Parameśvaravarman, son of Iśānavarman (Asīragarh seal) is mentioned in an inscription of Bihar which records the renewal of the grant of a village by Jīvitagupta II (great-grand-son of Ādityasena, whose date is A. D. 672-3). It speaks of Sarvavarman as one of the previous rulers of the regions connected with Nagarabhukti[4] and Vāruṇikagrāma[5]. It is impossible to say whether the rest of Bihar was annexed to the Maukharī dominions or not.

1. cf. DKM. 159-62.
2. cf. Ibid. 162-75 ; PHAI[6], 602 ff.
3. HAIB. 246 ; DKM. 175 ff.
4. Patna District.
5. Shahabad District (modern Deo Baraṇāk).

But, from the cave inscriptions in the Gaya district, one at Barābar Hill (ancient Pravaragiri) and two at the Nāgarajunī Hills it appears that by this time the Guptas had lost even Bihar to the Maukharīs and concentrated on Gauḍa and Mālava. The Maukharī-empire therefore extended upto Ahicchātra, and the frontier of the Thāneśvara kingdom on the West ; to Nālandā on the East ; on the north it may have touched the Terāi district and on the South it probably did not go beyond the Southern boundaries of the present United Provinees (Uttara Pradeśa)[1]. In otherwords, the whole of Bihar, including Magadha and Tirhut regions, was under the direct control of the Maukharīs, over which the Guptas acted only as chieftains or rulers under their Maukharī Overlords.[2]

THE VARDHANAS.

With the rise of the Vardhan-family towards the end of the 6th century A. D. at Thāneśvara, the centre of political gravity shifted from Magadha to Kanauj. Ādityavardhana's son Prabhākaravardhan created a considerable stir in the politics of Northern India by his military campaigns, and assumed the title of Mahārājādhirāja. But, violent shake-up followed his death. His daughter, Rājyaśrī's marriage with Grahavarman Maukharī resulted in Kanauj-Thāneśvara alliance. This was a cause of great apprehension to Devagupta, the king of Mālava (a

1. Tripathi, History of Kanauj, 55 & 31-32 ; Vaidya, HMHI. Vol. I, pp. 1 & 39 ; also cf. DKM. 201, 205 ff.
2. PHAI[6], 631.

traditional enemy of the Vardhanas) and Śaśāṅka, the powerful ruler of Gauḍa. They also formed an alliance to counteract the efforts of their common enemy[1]. As a result, tragic consequences followed. Grahavarman was killed by the Mālava king. Prabhākara's son Rājyavardhana defeated him but was later killed by Śaśāṅka. It seems that Śaśāṅka extended his authority over a large part of northern India which, besides other territories, included the whole of Bihar and Orissa[2]. This tends to show that he also controlled Tirhut for a time, though we have no information as to the administrative set-up there.

After the death of Rājyavardhana, Harṣavardhana ascended the throne of Thāneśvara, and later that of Kanauj. He launched upon a vigorous military campaign. Defeated and humiliated Śaśāṅka had to eschew his ambition to become the master of Northern India[3]. Harṣa continued on his persistent war activities for the first six years of his reign. He overran the "Five Indies", dashed the hopes of "mock conquerors" and extended the limits of his inherited empire, and curbed the powers of numerous

1. DKM. 245 ff.
2. DKM., 235, 244 ff. ; JBRS. 1949. pp. 119-20, 129, 133 & 143.
3. Ibid. 257 ; Also cf. HMHI., I, 30 ff ; Pannikar, Srī Harṣa, 17 ff ; CII., III, No. 78. 283 ff ; CR. 1928, pp. 207 ff ; IHQ XII. 142-43 ; EI. XII. 65 ff ; Barua, Op. Cit. 65-66 ; R. D Banerji, History of Orissa, Vol. I, 129 ; JBBRAS. (N. S.) I-II, pp. 116 ff ; IHI. pp. 50 ff . HC. (CT.), 17, 198-99 ff : HAIB, 272 ; EI., VI, 143 ff ; JASBL. XI, 1 ff ; ABORI. XIII, 300 ff ; EHI[4], 339.

warring states that continually disturbed the political equilibrium of the north[1].

Yuan Chwang represents him as having "brought the 'Five Indies' under his allegiance". These 'Five Indies' have been explained as comprising Svarāṣṭra or the Panjab; Kānyakubja, Mithilā (or Tirhut,), Gauḍa (or Bengal), and Utkala (or Orissa). Though not "master of India", Harṣa seems to have exercised his centrol over northern India, including Bihar (Mithilā, Vajjis, etc.). He "punished the kings of four parts of India "and in 641. A.D. assumed the title of King of Magadha[2]. But his crushing defeat at the hands of Pulkesin II "resulted in his complete discomfiture" and finally dashed his hopes of becoming "master of India" once for all[3].

We know, on the authority of Harṣa-Carita[4] that the outlying provinces during his time were put in charge of Governors. "The protector of all people (Harṣavardhana) appointed protectors in several directions". They were also known as *Sāmantas* and *Māhāsāmantas*, and wielded considerable power. Mādhavagupta was probably the Governor of Magadha. We have also mention of *Bhukti* and *Viṣayas* as in the Gupta Age. Tirhut or Vaiśālī must have formed one of the important *Bhuktis*. Wang hiuen-tse, speaks of Tirhut as *Tieh-lo* in the 6th century A. D.[5]. It

1. Tripathi, History of Kanauj, 77 ; DKM. 275 ; Dr. R. C. Majumdar, however, believes that Harṣavardhana was merely king of Kanauj (Vide—JBORS. 1923, p. 318).
2. IA. IX. 19 ; PHAI[6], 610 ; also see JIH. XXXII, 129-30.
3. JBORS. 1923, p. 319 ; IA. VI. 4 ff.
4. Cal. Ed., p. 211.
5. JBRS. 1952, p. 356 ; IA , 1911, p. 111 ; Beal, Si-Yu-Ki, i, Intro. XV.

seems, with the shifting of political gravity, the religious gravity also shifted from Vaiśālī to Kanauj where a Buddhist Assembly was convened. In 635 A. D. Yuang Chwang[1] came to Tirhut and found Buddhism waning in that region. On the other hand, Jaina Digambaras were in large number at Vaiśālī, Puṇḍravardhana and Samataṭa. Brāhmaṇism asserted its supremacy again. Mithilā, Kāśī, and Prayāga were the strongholds of Brāhmaṇism during this time, which is evident from Yuan Chwang's reference to India as "the country of the Brāhmaṇas" (*Po-lo-men-kuo*)[2], and Bāṇa's mention of the "followers of Kapila, Kaṇāda and Upaniṣads, i. e., Vedāntins"[3].

THE TIBETAN INVASION

"A general scramble to feast on the carcase of the empire" followed the removal of the strong arm of Harṣa (647 A. D.). Bhāskaravarman of Kāmarūpa broke off his friendly relations with Kanauj and annexed Karṇasuvarṇa and the adjacent territories[4]. Mādhavagupta's son, Ādityasena, a feudatory of Harṣa in Magadha shook off his allegiance to the Imperial power and revived the grandeur

1. Rhys Davids, Travels of Yuan Chwang, II, pp. 63-80.
2. Ibid.
3. Op. Cit.
4. From Nidhanpur copper plate (JKAS. II, 3 & 4 ; IC. I, pp. 421-31),it appears that his sway also extended over eastern Mithilā. From there he is said to have actively assisted the Chinese envoy in his compaign against Arjuna of Tirhut. (cf. R. K. Choudhary's article in JIH., XXXII, 130-31).

and glory of Magadha for a time[1]. He seems to have fully exploited the confusion that followed the usurpation of Harṣa's throne by Arjune, his minister in Tirhut and the latter's conflict with the combined Tibetan and Nepalese forces as told by the Chinese records.

It is said that Arjuna or Aruṇāśva, just after the emperor's death, insulted and injured the second Chinese mission of Wang-hiuen-tse. The latter fled to Nepal overnight and returned with a large army consisting of 1200 picked Tibetan soldiers supplied by the famous Tibetan king Srong-btsan-gampo and supported by a Napalese Contingent of 7000 horsemen sent by Nepalese king. The combined army stormed Tirhut only after a sieze of three days and massacred its people. Arjuna fled, revolted and was again defeated and carried a prisoner to China by the Chinese envoy. This envoy was also helped with money and other valuables by Kumāra Bhāskaravarman of Kāmarūpa[2]. Smith attaches much significance to this story[3]. But the story reads more like romance than sober history, for it is as difficult to accept the story of unprovoked hostility on the part of Arjuna as to believe in the utter rout of his army and thorough conquest of his country (Tirhut) by 8000 soldiers[4].

1. DKM. 289 ; $PHAI_6$, 610.
2. Tripathi, History of Kanauj, 189-90 ; JASB. VI. 69 ; IA. IX. 20 ; Asiatic Journal and Monthly Register for British, Foreign, India, China and Australia, 1836, pp. 220-21 ; IHQ. III. 792 ; HB. Vol. I. 91-93 ; DKM. 282-85 ; JRAS. 1880. pp 528 ff · JIH. XXXII.
3. EHI^4., 366-67.
4. HB. I, 92.

The absurdity of this exaggerated story raises certain significant points. The Chinese or Tibetan or Nepalese army would not have been so strong and the system of warfare so improved as to defeat several thousand Indians and annihilate them as the English did the Mohammedans at Plassey or the Hindus at Assaye. If Arjuna had usurped Harṣa's throne, where was then the mighty military-machine reared by Harṣa who had conquered and kept in subjugation the whole Northern India ? Even so, the fall of Tirhut was not sufficient to humble the usurper, and Kanauj itself should have been besiezed. The scene was laid at Tirhut, not Kanauj. This in itself is a sufficient proof not to believe the story. Besides, coming as it does from the Chinese sources there is a tendency towards exaggeration. The horrible cruelty and rapaciousness, with which the Chinese envoy massacred the population of Tirhut, reflect little credit on a Buddhist mission[1]. What seems to be true is that after the death of Harṣa, Arjuna, a petty Brāhmaṇa Governor or king of Tirhut asserted independence and insulted the Chinese mission probably because of his hatred towards them. The envoy escaped to Tibet and obtained some aid form that country and Nepal. Full of revenge he attacked the petty chief, defeated him, massacred the people of Tirhut and probably carried him to China as a prisoner. It was, therefore, a local affair and Arjuna cannot be supposed to have siezed the throne and power of Harṣa. It is also possible that

1. IHQ. III. 792.

apparently Tirhut remained subject for some time to Tibet, which was then a powerful state[1].

The subjugation of Tirhut, however, seems to have been of a short duration. The powerful king Ādityasena must have broken the fetters of Tibetan yoke in course of his final bid to restore the lost glories of the Guptas. A number of inscriptions – the Shahapur inscription (yr. 66 of the H.E., i.e., 672 A.D.), the Aphṣād, Deo-Barṇāk and Mandār inscriptions (found in Gaya, Bhagalpur district etc.) describe his various activities and crown him with the epithet of *Paramabhaṭṭāraka Mahārājādhirāja*. The territorial limit as given in the Deoghar inscription (originally Mandār Hills) makes it quite clear that "soon after the sceptre dropped from the hand of Harṣa, Āditya raised himself to a paramount position and brought under his domination lands formerly subject to Kanauj"[2]. He is described as "the ruler of the (whole) earth upto the shores of oceans ; the performer of Aśvamedha and other

1. DKM. 277 & 284. Dr. H. C. Ray (DHNI. Vol. I. p. 274) observes that the Chinese and Tibetan documents do not tell us whether Tibet had any influence over the territories of Bengal and Bihar. According to T'ang Annals, however, Nepal and India threw off the suzerainty of Tibet about the year 703 A. D. Sylvain Levi accepts the date 702 A. D. According to him this event began a new phase in Mithilā's history which was marked by the re-establishment of the Later Guptas in Magadha. (Vide—Le' Nepal, II. 174-75), Also cf. JMOS. 1911, p. 133 ; JBORS. XXII. 161 ff ; JRAS. 1880, pp. 546, 556, 528 ; Antiquities of Tibet, Vol. II, p. 82 ; IA. 1916. p. 39 ; IHQ. xv. (Supplement), 59-62.
2. CII. Vol. III. 212-13 ; For his inscriptions, Nos. 42-45, pp. 200-211 ff.

great sacrifices". A Nepalese record describes him as "Great Ādityasena, the illustrious Lord of Magadhas"[1]. These evidences prove that the territories comprising Magadha, Tirhut (Vaiśālī, Mithilā) upto the Himālaya (if not the whole of Northern India) came to be directly ruled by Ādityasena[2] who must have been alive in A. D. 672-73. Licchavi king Śivadeva of Nepal was his contemporary, who was the son-in-law of the Maukharī Bhogavarman who had himself married the daughter of Ādityasena[3].

After Ādityasena, Devagupta III[4], Viṣṇugupta[5] and his son, Jīvitagupta II[6] dominated the scene successively. All of them continued the imperial titles. That these were not empty forms are clear from the records of the Western Cālukyas which testify to the existence of a Pan-North Indian empire in the last quarter of the seventh century A. D.[7] They were the only *Uttarāpathanātha* laying claim to the Imperial dignity during this period.

The following period saw the final eclipse of the Guptas. The invasion by the Western Cālukya king Vinayāditya and Yaśovarman, king of Kanauj were too much for the fast waning Guptas to survive. Vākpati, the author of famous *Gauḍavaho*[8] refers to the humiliating defeat of the king of Magadha by Yaśovarman, who "fled

1. IA. IX. 181.
2. DKM. 289 ff.
3. CII. III. 610.
4. DKM. 304. ff.
5. Ibid. 310.
6. Ibid. 310 ff.
7. PHAI[6], 611 ; IA. X, 110 ff,
8. Ed. S. P. Pandit, Verses 414, 687-97, pp. 354 ff.

before him through fear." If his 'subjugation of the Himālaya country" and "world conquest" are to be believed, we have no doubt that he trampled down practically all the regions lying between the Magadhan region and the Himālaya including Tirhut[1]. The evidences contained in the Nālandā stone inscription of Yaśovarmmadeva also tend to confirm our contention[2].

Ray Chaudhuri believes that in the time of Yaśovarman of Kanauj, *i.e.*, in the first half of the 8th. century A. D. a Gauḍa king occupied the throne of Magadha[3]. But the inscriptions and the literature of the period record that Lalitāditya Muktāpīḍa, not any Vaṅga king, uprooted Yaśovarman entirely[4]. It is probable that the Vaṅga king, referred to, was Gopāla who is represented by Tāranātha as originally ruling in Gauḍa. Afterwards he succeeded in reducing Magadha.

The Pālas, Gurjaras & Candellas

In the following period Northern India presented its normal aspect of a group of independent and mutually

1. Dr. B. P. Sinha observes : "From the Chinese and Tibetan records we learn that in cir. 703 A. D. Nepal and Indian provinces of the Tibetan empire revolted. It is quite possible that Tīrabhukti, which may have formed a part of the Tibetan empire since 644 A. D., may have been annexed to the empire of Magadha in the time of Viṣṇugupta or Jīvitagupta II. But the later Gupta dynasty and their extensive empire came to an inglorious end at the hands of Yaśovarman". (Vide—DKM. 316).
2. EI. XX. 37-46 ; XII, 40 ; ASR. 1925-26, pp. 131 & 138 ; HK. 250-56.
3. PHIA[6], 611, fn 4.
4. HK. 201-04 ; DKM. 317 ff.

warring states. We are told that after Lalitāditya another invasion of Bengal-Bihar was undertaken by the Kāmarūpa king Śrī–Harṣa, referred to in the Paśupati inscription of his son-in-law Jayadeva of Nepal (748 A. D.)[1]. Yet another invasion by Kāśmīrī king Jayadeva was directed and the "Five Gauḍas" (Tīrabhukti being one of them) were conquered and placed in the charge of Jayadeva's father-in-law whose identity is problematical. Possibly this man was no other than Gopāla[2].

Tāranātha, the noted Tibetan historian, refers to the condition of this region just before the election of Gopāla, the founder of the Pāla dynasty. "There was no longer any member of it (the royal family of the Candras a king; in Odiviśa, in Bengal and other five provinces (obviously Mithilā being one of them) to the east. Each Kṣatriya, Brāhmaṇa and merchant (Vaiśya) constituted himself but there was no king ruling the country."[3] "*Matsya-nyāya*"[4] ("a condition of existence where there is no established government, encouraging every strong man to consider himself superior to his surroundings and engage in acts of self-aggrandisement at the cost of his weaker neighbours") was the order of day in North-Eastern India.

From Lāmā Tāranātha's account of Bengal[5] we further learn that one Bālacandra, son of Siṃhacandra (during

1. IA, IX. 178 ff.
2. HAIB., 309-10.
3. IA, IV. 365-66.
4. It literally means **The Law of the fish**, where larger fishes swallow up the smaller ones.
5. History of Buddhism in India in the year 1608 A. D., pp 146, 158 & 172.

the time of Śrī Harṣa, *i.e.*, Harṣavardhana) of the Candra family, being driven from Bhaṅgala (presumably by the powerful king Pañcama Siṃha of the Licchavi family whose kingdom extended from Tibet to Triliṅga and Banaras to the sea) ruled in Tīrahuti (*i.e.*, Tīrabhukti). Bālacandra's son Vimalacandra, however, retrieved the fortunes of his family, and ruled over the three kingdoms—Bhaṅgala (Bengal), Kāmarūpa (Assam) and Tīrahuti (Tirhut, North Bihar). His son was Govindacandra who was succeeded by his son Lalitacandra, and both of them attained *Siddhi*. They ruled over the same territories. Then followed a period of anarchy in the five eastern provinces referred to above before the election of Gopāla[1].

Gopāla was the product of this chaotic condition. He was elected king of Bengal by the people (c. 750 A. D.— c. 770 A. D.). He soon rose to the stature of a full-fledged king, triumphing over the forces tending to anarchy and lawlessness. Bihar soon came under his control. In the Monghyr Grant of Devapāla he is, however, described as the "Lord of the Earth" and "the crest-jewel of the heads of monarchs."[2] Epigraphic sources tend to show that he exercised some influence, if not the complete sway, over Tīrabhukti[3].

With the accession of Dharmapāla (Gopāla's son) to the throne (770 A. D.), the history of North-Eastern India enters upon a complicated stage characterised by the rivalry

1. HB. I., 183 ; HAIB., 375 ; IHQ. XVI. 220-28 ; JIH. XXXII. 131-32.
2. EI. XVII. 304 ; DKM. 333 ff.
3. EI. I, 122 ; ASR. II. 451 ; JIH. XXXII, 132 ; Singh, 54.

of the Pāla dynasty with other powers of the time, especially the Gurjaras and the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. Rāṣṭrakūṭa kings Dhruva (c. 780–94 A. D.) and his son Govinda III (c. 794-814 A. D.) sent their strong military expeditions to extend their sway in Northern India and brilliant, though temporary, successes crowned their efforts[1]. In the north were the Gurjara-Pratihāras whose hostility with the Pālas "constitutes an outstanding feature of the political transactions of Northern India during the period under review and nearly a century subsequent to it"[2].

Shortly after his accession Dharmapāla was dragged in the Tripartite struggle involving the three chief powers of India, viz., the Pālas, the Rāṣṭakūṭas, and the Gurjara-Pratihāras. Dharmapāla clashed with Vatsarāja, the Gurjara-Pratihāra king and was disastrously defeated. But the providential intervention of Dhruva saved him from utter ruin as the latter crushingly defeated Vatsarāja. This competition for supremacy in Northern India stopped for a while following the withdrawal of Dhruva from the scene. Dharmapāla pushed up ahead. Having defeated Indrāyudha, he siezed the throne of Mahodaya (Kanauj), and subjugated the Bhojas, the Matsyas, the Kurus, the Yadus, the Yavanas, etc[3]. The list of kingdoms conquered by Dharmapāla presented in the Khalimpur Grant, as well as in Tāranātha's history, includes, besides other countries, Tirapute (Tirhut) and Gauḍa[4]. According to R. C.

1. HB. I, 104.
2 Ibid.
3. cf. V. 13 of the Khalimpur Grant of Dharmapāla (Vide--EI. Vol. IV. 251 ff.)
4. IA. IX. 366.

Majumdar, his conquest of Magadha, a large part of U. P. and other territories took place between A. D. 770–790, and his victorious campaigns upto the Indus on the west, Himālaya in the north and even beyond Narmadā in the south were completed between 790–800 A.D.[1]

But the gloomy days were soon to befall the Pāla monarch. The revival of the Gurjara power under its powerful king Nāgabhaṭa II crippled the influence of Gauḍa Cakrāyudha, who was badly defeated and discomfitured as is evident from the Gwalior Praśasti of Bhoja[2]. It is possible that the *digvijaya* of the Rāṣṭakūṭa emperor Govinda III, son of Vatsarāja's conqueror Dhruva, preceded the Gurjara occupation of Kanauj under Nāgabhaṭa II. In course of his campaign in Northern India he defeated Nāgabhaṭa[3] and "the water of the springs of the Himālaya mountains was drunk by Govinda III's horses and plunged into by his elephants .... (and) to whom the great one (those kings) Dharma and Cakrāyudha surrendered of themselves"[4]. But the quick departure of Govinda from Northern India facilitated the path of Nāgabhaṭa who 'defeated Dharmapāla, removed Cakrāyudha from the throne of Kanauj and boldly annexed it". The battle between Nāgabhaṭa II and Dharmapāla was probably fought at Monghyr or Mudgagiri[5]. This shows that the encounter between the two contending forces must have taken place

1. HB. I, 140; Account of Lāmā Tāranātha, 216-17.
2. EI. XVIII 110ff.
3. cf. Verse 23 of the Sañjan Plates of Amoghavarṣa, (Vide—EI. XVIII. 233ff).
4. IA. XII. 156. EI. XVII, 245 ff.
5. EI. IX. 96-98 (Jodhapur Inscription of Bāuka, Verse 24).

in or near about the plains of Tirhut itself which probably included Monghyr or Mudgagiri. Tirhut, therefore, must also have formed one of the main war-theatres of this Tripartite struggle. Moreover, if these alleged conquests were actually made, then Nāgabhaṭa's sphere of conquest covered all the regions from the east to the west and from the Himālaya to the Narmadā, excluding of course the north-western parts and the Pāla dominions[1]. Whatever the suffling and commotion for a short period as a result of this struggle, Dharmapāla's position seems to have been fully established in Bihar as is evident from the Khalimpur record, Keśava Praśasti and the Bhagalpur Grant.

He also succeeded in establishing himself as the paramount ruler of Northern India, Soḍḍhala, a Gujrātī poet of the 11th century, refers to him as *Uttarāpatha-svāmī*[2]. His empire extended from the Punjab in the west to Bengal in the east, from the Himālaya in the north to Central India and probably even up to Berar in the south. He subjugated Kāmarūpa, Tīrahuti (Tirhut), Gauḍa and other countries[3]. The Monghyr copper-plate[4] also refers to his compaign at the foot of the Himālaya. It also appears probable that he acquired supremacy over Nepal, after having conquered Mithilā[5]. *Parameśvara Paramabhaṭṭāraka Mahārājādhirāja* Devapāla (son of Dharmapāla) fully inherited the prowess and abilities of his father. The

1. HK. 234. DKM, 350.
2. Annals, XIII. 197 ff ; "Udaya Sundari Kathā" GOS. 4-6.
3. Account of Lāmā Tāranātha, 216-17.
4. IC. IV. 266.
5. JIH. XXXII, 134; also cf. DKM. 342-44.

Monghyr Grant[1] describes this king as enjoying the whole region "bounded on the north by the Himālayas, in the south by Rāma's bridge, and by the abodes of Varuṇa and Lakṣmī (i. e., the oceans), on the east and west". The Bādal Pillar inscription[2] (or the Garuḍa Pillar inscription) of the time of Nārāyaṇapāla also speaks eloquently of the extension of his authority from the Himālaya to the Vindhya. In other words, he exacted tributes from the whole of Northern India. He is also represented as having subjugated the king of Kāmarūpa, and defeated Mihira Bhoja, the Gurjara-Pratihāra king[3]. Making due allowance for the exaggerations contained in the Pāla records, e. g., the Monghyr Grant, the Nālandā Grant, the Ghośrawa stone inscriptions, the Nālandā image inscription, etc., it can, however, be safely assumed that Devapāla atleast retained his hold on Bihar and North Bengal, and his claim to have won the enjoyment of universal sovereignty[4] is not very far from truth[5]. Under him the Pāla empire reached its zenith.

"The glory and the brilliance" of the empire did not long survive the death of Devapāla. The process of decline and disintegration had gradually set in. The Pāla power in North India was reduced to nonentity. Vigrahapāla I (or Surapāla ?[6]) inspite of his hold over his ancestral territory was "a shadowy figure".

1. IA. XXI. 255 ff. (Verse 15).
2. EI. II, 165 ff. (Verse 5).
3. IA. XV. 305; EI., XVIII., pp. 109, 113,fn. 4; DHNI. I, 296 ff; JIH, XXXII, 134.
4. IA. XV. 304 ff.
5. DKM. 375.
6. Scholars generally hold that Vigrahapala and Sūrapala were

We have five inscriptions of Nārāyaṇapāla (son of Vigrahapāla)—the Gaya Stone inscription[1], the Indian Museum stone inscription[2], the Bhagalpur Grant[3], the Bādal Pillar inscription[4], and the Uddantapura Image inscription[5] all recovered from Bihar. The Bhagalpur Grant[6] is of great interest, for the Śāsana was issued from the Jayaskandhāvāra at Mudgagiri. It records the grant of Mukuṭikāgrāma *Kakṣa-Viṣaya* in Tīrabhukti (Tirahut) by *Ps.-M. Vigrahapāladevapādānudhyāta P.-Pr. M. Nārāyaṇapāladeva* to the temple of Śiva-bhaṭṭāraka and Paśupatācārya-pariṣad at Kalaśapota. The gift was made in 17th year of the king who boasts of having "built 1000 temples for the said Śiva in the same locality"[7]. These evidences fully establish that Nārāyaṇapāla's sway over the Tirhut region was predominant and obeyed unreservedly, besides a large portion of Bihar. Then, there is a total lack of Pāla documents for about 37 years which clearly points to the positive decline in the fortunes of the family. This is also confirmed by the Nilgund Stone inscription of Amoghavarṣa

defferent names of the same person. Dr. B. P. Sinha, however, rightly takes them to be two defferent persons (DKM. 379). Sūrapāla was either a son of Devapāla or of Yuvarāja Rājyapāla who may have predeceased his father Devapāla (Ibid. 378-85).

1. ASR. III, p. 120. No. 6.
2. Baṅgīya Sāhitya Patrikā, XV. 13; MASB. V. p. 62, No. 3.
3. IA. XV. 304 ff.
4. Gauḍarājamālā 70 ff.
5. IA., 1918, pp. 109-10.
6. IA. XV. 304 ff.
7. Ibid. lines 38-39.

(866 A. D.)[1] which describes the rulers of Aṅga, Vaṅga, and Magadha worshipping him. Kṛṣṇa II is also represented as having initiated the Gauḍas in Vinayavrata and received worship from Aṅgas, Magadhas, and others[2]. We have also unquestionable epigraphic evidences[3] to show that Bhoja and his son Mahendrapāla held the whole of Northern India from the Karnal district in the Punjab to the Kāṭhiāwad peninsula in the south and the borders of the Pāla dominions in the east. No doubt can be entertained about the fact that Bhoja and following him Mahendrapāla extended their authority upto the Himālaya including the Tirhut region, and Hazaribagh districts[4]. Thus the Pāla empire was passing through a stage of serious decadence. The Gurjaras gradually pushed up their conquests eastward along the northern bank of the Gaṅgā, till in the 13th year of Mahendrapāla, the whole of Tīrabhukti and northern Bengal seem to have been annexed by them, leaving the rest to the Pālas.[5]

The Gurjaras were also dealt a fatal blow by Indra III, the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king. From the Combay Plates we know

1. EI. VI, p. 103 (line 8);IA. XII, p. 218 (line 6).
2. EI. V, 193.
3. EI. I, 162 ff; IX. p. 3; V. 208 ff; IA. XV. 112; HK. 246, 252; IHQ. XVI. 181.
4. ASI., 1903-04, p, 282 (V. 21); HK 252; DKM. 390-91, 393-94; PB. 59; DHNI. I, 303; R. K. Choudhary believes that Mahendrapāla failed to conquer the whole of Mithilā. He could hold his sway only over a part of it for some time. (Vide—JIH. XXXII, 135). His contention, however, lacks epigraphic evidences, which on the whole tend to show to the contrary. as already discussed above.
5. DHNI. Vol. I, 303 ff.

that the Rāṣṭrakūṭa expedition finally sealed the doom of the Gurjaras and accomplished the destruction of Kanauj. We are also told that the Rāṣṭrakūṭa General, a contemporary of Indra III, "bathed his horse at the juncture of the Ganges and Sea"[1].

Nārāyaṇapāla's successor was Rājyapāla. The stone inscription of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas at Bodhagayā[2] and a few other inscriptions of the Gurjara-Pratihāras show that the Pālas still held the Patna district, and most probably Monghyr (Munger), Bhagalpur and the Santal Parganas[3]. The Gurjaras still held their possession of the districts of Shahabad, Gaya and Hazaribagh, while in the north they overran the whole of Tīrabhukti and Varendrī. The Pratihāras snatched some portion of Mithilā from the Pālas probably after the 27th year of the reign of Nārāyaṇapāla[4]. This was, however, short-lived.

On the close heels of the Gurjaras and the Rāṣṭrakūṭas turned up the Candellas. From the Khajurāho inscription of the yr. 1011 (A. D. 953-54)[5] we know that Yaśovarman—son and successor of Harṣa—obtained an easy victory over the Gauḍas who were like " pleasure-creepers." He then captured the fortress of Kālañjara ; dealt another blow to the tottering Gurjaras ; weakened and conquered the Maithilas, and fought successfully against the Mālavas,

1. EI. VII. 26 ff ; Karṇāṭaka Sabdānuśāsana (Ed. Lewis Rice), 26-27 ; Also cf. DKM. 395 ff.
2. Buddha Gaya, p. 194, ins. No. 8 (dated 10th century A. D.).
3. cf. IA. XLVII. pp. 111 ff ; JBORS. XXVI. 236 ff; EI. XIV. 324 ff.
4. JIH., XXXII, 134.
5. EI. I, pp. 123 ff.

the Cedīs, the Khasas, and the Kurus[1]. The significant point is that Northern Bihar seems to have been outside the political jurisdiction of the Pālas at the time as is implied by the separate mention of Mithilā[2] in the list of the territories subjugated by Yaśovarman. We have already referred to the testimony of the Gurjara records describing them as "overrunning the whole of Tīrabhukti and Varendrī", which is again confirmed by the evidences contained in the Khajurāho inscription. These statements when read together, conclusively prove that the territory of Mithilā was conquered and wrested away from the Gurjaras by the Candellas. Mithilā during this period was like a roving ball being tossed about in between the warring powers for the same Khajurāho inscription informs us that his (Yaśovarman's) son Dhaṅga (c. A.D. 954-1000) also "established his upright rule over the earth," "perished hosts of enemies in battle"[3] and "whose feet were constantly worshipped with garlands fallen down from the crowns of princes." As a consequence, during the reign of Rājyapāla and his two successors Gopāla II and Vigrahapāla II, the Candella invasion of Bengal and other territories badly affected the entire body-politic of Northern India[4].

With the coming of Mahipāla I, the bleeding Pāla

1. Ibid. Verse 23.
2. Ibid. V. 23, line 2 : "शिथिलामिथिला"; also cf. DKM. 400 ; HAIB, 366 ; JIH. XXXII, 135.
3. Verse 44.
4. HB. I, 132.

empire heaved a shy of relief. His inscriptions[1] tend to show that he had his authority in Bihar at the beginning of his reign, and he also restored his ancestral kingdom. But his successors soon after seem to have lost their hold over the territories one by one and history has not condescended to record anything of note about them.

The history of Mithilā or Tirhut of the period under review is the history of constant war-fare and external invasions accompanied with indiscriminate depredations. She virtually presented a bloody spectable of retreating forces and advancing armies-all measuring their mighty swords and finally falling off one by one. The exit of one power was promptly followed by the coming-in of another. Almost all the upstart political adventurers, attempted, once at least, at reaching the foot of the Himālaya for the attainment of the much coveted, though hollow, glory of "Earth-Conqueror". She had thus fast developed into a cockpit of power--politics. She witnessed the glorious rise and tragic fall of various powers on and from her political horizon. Mithilā, after Harṣa's death, came to be ruled over, and ravaged and devastated by the Tibetans, the Later Guptas, the Maukharīs, the Pālas, the Gurjara-Pratiharas, the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and the Candellas in succession. As a result, the whole tract of land practically lay prostrate and bleeding.

Bendall, Cat. Buddh. Skt. MSS. in the University Library of Cambridge, p. 101 ff ; JASB. IV (N. S.), 106-07 ; XI (N. S.) 17 ff ; EI. XVII, 353-55 ; DHNI. I, p. 311 ; IHQ. XVI. 179 ff: EI. XIV. 328 ff ; IC. IX. 121 ff ; MASB. V. p. 75 ; JBORS. XXV, 236 ff. No. 49.

After the Candellas of Jejābhukiti, it was now the turn of the Cedīs or Kalacurīs of Dāhala (Tripuri, near Jubbulpore) to fish in this troubled water. Gāṅgeyadeva Vikramāditya (Kalacurī or Cedī king) struck speedily (A.D.1037)[1]. A manuscript of the Rāmāyaṇa completed by a Nepalese Kāyastha in V. S. 1076 (A.D. 1019) mentions Gāṅgeyadeva of the Lunar race as the ruler of Tīrabhukti ('*śrīmad Gāṅgeyadeva-bhujyamāna-Tīrabhuktau*")[2].

Some scholars believe that this Gāṅgeyadeva was none other than the famous Cedī king, father of Karṇadeva[3]. But, M. Sylvain Levi[4] doubts this identification as: (*i*) the titles ending in *Avaloka* are more characteristic of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, and are not known to be used by the Kalacurīs; (*ii*) the title *Gauḍadhvaja* indicates some political authority in Gauḍa, and there is no evidence that the Kalacurī king Gāṅgeyadeva had any pretensions to suzerainty over Bengal, and (*iii*) Kalacurī king Gāṅgeyadeva is not known from any other sources to have ruled over Tirhut. R. P. Canda[5] adds one more to this list. According to

1. CASR. XXI. 113.
2. Bendall (JASB. 1903, pt. I, p 18-19), transcribed the relevant passage in the Colophon of the MS. as follows: " महाराजाधिराज पुण्यावलोक-सोम-वंशोद्भव-गौड़-ध्वज-श्रीमद् गांगेयदेव-भुज्यमान-तीरभुक्तौ कल्याणविजयराज्ये नेपालदेशीय-श्रीमान चुशालिक-श्री आनन्ददास्य पाटकावस्थित (कायस्थ) पंडित श्री-श्रीकुरस्यात्मजा श्री गोपति-आलेखितम् " ; See also JBORS. IX, 300 ; X, 39.
3. R. D. Banerji, MASB. V. pp. 75-76 ; Ray, DHNI. I. p. 317 ; Jayaswal, JBORS. IX, 300 ff ; A. Ghosh. IC. VII. 3 ff.
4. Le Nepal, II, p. 202, note I (quoted by R. C. Majumdar in IHQ. VII. pp. 679 ff).
5. Gauḍarājamālā, p. 42, fn. 4.

him, Magadha, being under the Pālas and the territories to the west under the Candellas, it is difficult to believe that Kalacurī Gāṅgeya could rule over Tirhut. Majumdar[1] thinks that this Gāṅgeyadeva of Tirhut is identifical with Nānyadeva's successor Gaṅgadeva (1154 A.D.) and that the date of the manuscript should be referred to the Śaka era.

Levi's objection to the use of "titles ending in *avaloka*" does not seriously stand in our way for the Commentary of Nānyadeva, a Karṇāṭa Kṣatriya also crowns the writer (Nānya) with the same epithet[2]. The epithet, in our opinion, was a conventional one, like several other titles and could be used by kings, whatsoever. As regards the second contention of Levi and also that of R. P. Canda it can safely be asserted that Gāṅgeyedeva's supremacy in Mithilā was probably the consequence of a victory over Mahipāla, the Pāla ruler, and the former seems to have been justified in being called a Gauḍa ruler, by virtue of his possession of Mithilā, since this territory was considered to be a part of the traditional five divisions of the Gauḍa country. That he must have conquered the ruler of Gauda is to be inferred from the high-sounding epithets of "Vikramāditya"[3] and "conqueror of the Universe", bestowed on him in Candella inscriptions found at Mahobā.[4] His third contention also does not stand on surer ground, for we have a definite evidence of his extensive conquest

1. IHQ. VII. 681.
2. QJAHRS. Vol. I. p. 56 : "····धर्मावलोक श्रीमन्नान्यपति विरचिते···"
3. EI. II. p. 3.
4. Ibid, II, pp. 219, 22 ; I, p. 122.

recorded in verse 21 of the Piawān inscription,[1] though his suzerainty over Tirhut is not explicitly mentioned. But as the inscription belongs to a Candella king, who seems to have been his rival, we have less ground to entertain any doubt about its genuineness. The Sāranātha inscription records the fight of the Pāla ruler against the Kalacurī or Cedī Gāṅgeyadeva[2]. It also refers to the repair of certain religious buildings in this region under his auspices in V. S. 1083. This, in turn, shows that he conquered it from Gāṅgeyadeva sometime between 1019 A. D. and 1026 A. D. Majumdar's suggestion is also untenable for the date A. D. 1019 assigned to the ruler of Tirhut in the Nepalese colophon is quite in agreement with the dates A. D. 1093, 1030, 1037, and 1041, assigned to the Cedī king in his inscriptions.[3] Levi's suggestion that this Gāṅgeyadeva was perhaps a member of a local branch of the Kalacurīs is wide the mark, as the existence of a second Gāṅgeyadeva is at least hypothetical[4].

V. V. Mirashi[5] has, however, tried to refute the whole theory of Kalacurī occupation of Tirhut by pointing out that the reading *Gauḍadhvaja* in the colophon of the Rāmāyaṇa MS. is incorrect, and it should be read *Garuḍadhvaja* instead. He further asserts that Gāṅgeyadeva of

1. CASR. XII. 113.
2. IA. XIV. 139-40.
3. cf. JASB. 1903, pt I, p. 18; Alberuni's India, 202; EI V. 406 ff; EI. VIII. 146, respectively.
4. HAIB. 389. Local traditions in Mithilā also maintain that Nānyadeva's successor was Gaṅgadeva, ant not Gāṅgeyadeva; also see DHNI. I. 316-17.
5. Annals (Silver Jubilee Vol.), 1942, p. 293; for details, 291-301.

the colophon bearing the biruda *Puṇyāvaloka* was a worshipper of Viṣṇu (Garuḍadhvaja), and, therefore, he could not be the Kalacuri king Gāṅgeyadeva Vikramāditya. No Kalacuri king had any biruda ending in "*avaloka*", and they were worshippers of Śiva, and not Viṣṇu. He may have been a Rāṣṭrakūṭa as Rāṣṭrakūta princes are known to have assumed birudas ending in "*avaloka*"[1]. It is possible that he may belong to the Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty whose inscription has been discovered at Bodh Gaya,[2] and this local dynasty may have ruled over Mithilā. But the find-spot in Gaya does not prove that they ever ruled over that district.[3] This Gāṅgeyadeva, therefore, seems to be identical with the father of Lakṣmī Karṇa, and the latter was probably defeated sometime between A.D. 1019 and 1026 by Mahipāla, the Pāla ruler who conquered Banaras and also the Tirhut region from the Kalacurī ruler.[4]

How long Mithilā or Tirhut remained under the Cedīs-cannot definitely be ascertained. Jayaswal thinks that the duration of the Cedī rule in Mithilā must have been for near about a century.[5] This statement cannot meet with general agreement. Moreover we have no solid evidences to support it. We must remember that no stable government for a century could have been established and functioning in Mithilā during this period of invasions and

1. cf Bomb. Gaz.. Vol. I. pt ii, p 389.
2. Buddha-Gaya, 193 ff.
3. DKM. 412; For detailed discussion of different thories, see Ibid.-408-12.
4. Ibid. 412; Majumdar. Ancient India, 336-37, 343; JASB. XVII 1951, No. 1. p. 27. See alsoAnnals, XXXV. pp. 103-06.
5. JBORS. IX. 300.

counter-invasions. The fickle fortune soon deserted the Cedīs and fell once more into the lap of the reviving Pālas, under Mahipāla. The two Imādpur Image inscriptions (Muzaffarpur district) dedicated in the 48th year of his reign, probably show that Northern Bihar, especially the Tirhut region was recovered by him[1]. The distribution of his inscriptions justifiably demonstrates that whatever the limits of his ancestral dominions at the time of his accession, before 48th year he ruled over Gaya, Patna and Muzaffarpur (Mithilā or Tīrabhukti) districts in Bihar.[2] It is also possible that this region again fell into the hands of the Cedīs, soon after the death of Mahipāla (c. 1032 A. D) as the Banaras plates of Karṇa (1042 A. D.) tend to suggest.[3] In the latter part of Mahipāla's reign, another powerful ruler from the south, Rājendra Cola (A. D. 1011–12), son of Rājarājadeva advanced towards north. and sacked the different territories of Bengal, conquered the Sūras and subjugated the Kosalas.[4] But the mighty Colas could not push up their conquests beyond

1. IA. XIV. 165. note 17 ; Bhandarkar's List, No. 1628.
2. IHQ. XXX. 382 ff ; PIHC. Bombay, 1947, pp. 245 ff ; JIH. XXXII, 136 ff ; DHNI. I, 316 ; DKM. 408, 412.
3. Banaras seems to have passed into the hands of the Cedīs before 1033 A. D. It was then under Gaṅga whom Elliot identifies with Gāṅgeyadeva (Vol. II, p. 123 ; IC. VII. 7 ; DKM. 413); also cf. HB. I, 165 ff.
4. cf. The Tirumalai irscription of the 13th year of Rājendra Cola I (EI. IX, 229 ff.) ; The Tiruvālangādu plates (ASIAR, 1911-12, pp. 171 ff) ; DHNI. I, 318 ; HAIB. 390 ff ; Aiyangar, Ancient India, 108 ff ; Sastri. The Colas, I, 251 ff ; DKM. 414 ff.

the Gaṅgā, and Mithilā fortunately escaped the disastrous stroke of the Cola-swords.[1] Meanwhile, the Muslim hoardes had also infiltrated and started measuring their arms with the local powers.[2] These elements gave Mahipāla some very anxious moments of his life. His embarrassing task was to keep off the enemies of his country—the Candellas, the Colas, the Cedīs etc., who kept his hands full. The situation around had grown tremendously explosive and Northern India needed a man of the calibre of a Samudragupta or a Candragupta or a Dharmapāla to ward off the dangers looming large over its political horizon. But that was not to be. Mahipāla's son Nayapāla shone brilliantly for a while, but this light too was like "the last flicker of a lamp soon to be extinguished." The imperial fabric was shattered and was fast crumbling to pieces Meanwhile, new but strong forces had risen and shot up. The result was the establishment of a numerous petty dynasties in Bihar and Bengal—the most significant being the Karṇāṭas of Mithilā and the Senas of Bengal.[3]

The reign of Nayapāla saw the renewed but more vigorous attacks of the erstwhile beaten Cedīs, under the leadership of Gāṅgeyadeva's son Lakṣmī Karṇa (c. 1041—1072 A. D.). The Cedī spectre this time assumed a more portentous shape. He revived his father's policy of hostility against Gauḍa. His relationship with Gauḍa probably extended over two consecutive reigns—those of Nayapāla

1. cf. DKM. 415 ff.
2. JBORS. X, 37-39.
3. DHNI. I. 316, fn. 3 & 398.

and Vigrahapāla III. He fully aggrandised himself in northern India and sacked Magadha several times, but a treaty between the two contending forces seems to have been brought about (probably through matrimonial alliance) in the time of Vigrahapāla III through the mediation of Ācārya Atīśa (1042 A. D.)[1]. From the inscription of king Udgāditya we know that he "swept over the earth like a mighty sea" and aspired for the conquest of whole of India. This was, however, foiled as he had to sustain defeat towards the latter part of his life. But his sway over Banaras and Mithilā remained unshaken[2]. His son Yaśaḥ-Karṇa (1073 A. D.)[3] also probably maintained the Cedī power over the region.

But from other records it appears that he could not make any permanent impression in Tirhut. All told, it was only a raid. The Rāmacarita[4] says that Vigrahapāla III defeated Karṇa. The recent discovery of two new Pāla inscriptions at Naulāgarh (lying to the north at a distance of about sixteen miles from Begusarai, monghyr) by Prof. R. K. Chaudhary[5] confirms the evidence of Pāla rule in Tirhut. A silver coin was also discovered in that region, which, according to Dr. Altekar, belonged to Vigrahapāla III.

1. JASB. 1900, pp. 191-93 ; HAIB. 401.
2. JBORS. X, 39, fn 3.
3. EI. XII, 206
4. 1, 9, Commentary.
5. G. D. College Bulletin Series, Nos. 1-2. The inscription has also been edited by Dr. D. C. Sircar in JBRS. XXXVII. pts. 3-4, pp. 1-4.

Inscription No. 1 is important in that it supports the proof of Pāla rule in North Bihar or Mithilā as evidenced by the Bongāon Copper plate of Vigrahapāla III, discovered and edited by Dr. D. C. Sircar. It bolongs to the twentyfourth regnal year of king Vigrahapāla[1], and records the construction of an image on the pedestal of which it is inscribed.

During the time of Vigrahapāla III the Pālas were losing their political hold not only on Bengal, but also in Bihar. But they appear to have continued their sway over Mithilā till the reign of Rāmapāla. The discovery of Pāla images, still unnoticed, in different parts of Mithilā suggests that the Pālas had a continued rule in Tirhut.[2]

A palm-leaf manuscript of Kubijāmataṃ[3] notes in the colophon that it was copied under the reign of Buddhist emperor Rāmapāladeva, the suzerain of Nepal[4], who recovered Mithilā and Assam. The Kamauli Copper-plate grant of Vaidyadeva[5] records that Rāmapāla spread his glory by gaining the country of Janaka, *i.e.*, Mithilā. Thus, Rāmapāla attempted a partial rejuvenation but the essential vitality of the empire had gone.

It was now the turn of the Cālukya Someśvara I (1040-69 A. D.) who, according to Bilhaṇa's Vikramāṅka-deva-carita (Buhler's Intro.) stormed Dhāra, the capital of the Paramāras in Mālava from which king Bhoja had to flee and that he utterly destroyed the power of Karṇa,

1. Ibid. 2.
2. JIH XXXII, 137-38.
3. Sastri-Catalogue 54.
4. Jayaswal, Chronology & History of Nepal, 99 ff.
5. EI II. 355 (Verse 4).

king of Dāhala.[1] This Bhoja is described as having "possessed the earth upto the Kailāśa mountains".[2] It is probable that Bhoja held his sway over Mithilā for some time. The volumes of Maithilī legends woven round the personality of a certain Bhoja do not preclude the possibility of this suggestion altogether. He was, however, soon ousted from the region by Kalacurī Karṇa.

Someśvara I's son Vikramāditya also led victorious expeditions against Gauḍa and Kāmarūpa, at least twice during his reign. A record dated 1098 A D. says that Vikramāditya VI, after crossing the river Narmadā conquered kings on the other side of the river. Another record of A. D. 1098 confirms that he was then in the northern part of the kingdom on the northern banks of the Narmadā.[3] Thus the two Karṇāṭa kings, the father and the son, played a very effective and significant part in the politics of Northern India, during the latter half of the 11th century A. D. Apart from the states mentiond above, they claimed to have established their suzerainty over distant Nepal. An inscription of Someśvara III, the son and successor of Vikramāditya VI, describes him as having placed his feet upon the heads of the kings of Āndhra, Draviḍa, Magadha and Nepal.[4] We have no further records of his military campaigns. With the exception of the southern expedition "the records do not seem to mention any campaigns made by him, and his reign

1. IHQ. VII. 683.
2. EI. I, 237-38.
3. IHQ. VII. 682-83.
4. JBBRAS. XI. 268 ; IHQ. VII. 683.

seems in fact to be a very tranquil one." His pretensions, therefore, over the northern states—nominal or real—must have been derived from his father or grand-father.[1]

The downfall of the Cedī king Karṇa and the Paramāra Bhoja caused by Someśvara I must have paved the way for Karṇāṭa supremacy in the north which "ushered in a new epoc in north Indian politics." The absence of any sovereign power coupled with the degeneration of the central authority into a lifeless machinery and the ever-mounting ambitions of the provincial potentates, accelerated by constant external invasions soon created a disturbed condition all over Northern India. As a result, powerful Karṇāṭa principalities came to be established there. It is however, interesting to note in this connection that about the same time when the Senas were establishing their supremacy in Bengal, another Karṇāṭa-chief Nānyadeva was striving in the same direction in Mithilā and Nepal. Moreover, Candradeva Gāhaḍavāla, a contemporary of Vijayasena of Gauḍa and Nānyadeva of Mithilā, had just founded the kingdom of Kanauj (1098 A. D.) "when kings and Karṇa had passed away."[2] It was just within a decade of this momentous event that the two Karṇāṭa Chiefs—Vijayasena and Nānyadeva—had established the respective kingdoms of Gauḍa and Mithilā. "It is, therefore, permissible to hold that the deluge of Karṇāṭa invasion—which had swept away the two mighty kings, Bhoja and Karṇa—ushered in three new dynasties at Kanauj, Mithilā, and Bengal."[3]

1. IHQ. VII. 683.
2. IA. XIV. 103.
3. IHQ. VII. 684.

Jayaswal believes that the time that seems to have become ripe for a new ruler in Tirhut, was probably after 1073 A. D., and before 1097 A. D., *i.e.*, the year of the death of Gāhaḍavāla Candradeva in Banaras, whose empire in the same year, according to epigraphic evidences, comprised Delhi, Banaras and Ayodhyā. According to him, Tirhut at the time had been without a powerful ruler when the foundation of the Gāhaḍavāla empire was laid at Kanauj and the Gāhaḍavāla march would not have stopped at Ayodhyā, had a barrier not arisen in Tirhut. The opportunity had been availed of by Nānyadeva in the nick of time, *i.e.*, in or about 1093 A. D.[1]. The Nepalese chronicles have preserved rather conflicting traditions about the time of Nānyadeva. Sylvain Levi has, however, clearly established that Nānyadeva ascended the throne in 1097 A. D.[2]. This statement is contained in a drama *Muditakuvalayāśva*, and it has since been confirmed by a memorial verse preserved in the *Puruṣa-parīkṣā* of Vidyāpati. This is further corroborated by an Ms. written in 1097 A. D., in the reign of Nānyadeva himself[3].

Scholars generally agree with this date as established. The issue may, therefore, be regarded as finally settled. Jayaswal's contention that the Gāhaḍavāla march stopped at Ayodhyā because of this new "barrier" seems a hypothesis pure and simple. No contemporary evidences—literary or ephigraphic—tend to support this view. It seems that at the time when Nānya was building his king-

1. JBORS. IX. 307-08 ; X. 40-41.
2. Le Nepal, II, 197.
3. Ibid. II, 197, fn. 3 ; JBORS. IX. 304.

dom, king Candradeva was on the throne of Kanauj and was busy with repressing the aggressive activities of Vijayasena in the east[1]. It was of course Gāhaḍavāla Govindacandra who advanced as far as Mudgagiri or Monghyr as the Lar Plates of 1202 V. E. or 1146 A. D. show[2]. This constituted a great menace to Nānyadeva. But he must have been by then a well established king of Mithilā. Therefore, the time that Jayaswal speaks of, disallows any such apprehension on the the part of the Karṇāṭa king as it was the time that fully absorbed the attention of both Nānyadeva and Gāhaḍavāla Candradeva in settling their houses in order before launching upon a career of conquest and aggrandisement.

1. HK. 303.
2. EI. VII. 98-99.

PART II

CHAPTER V

THE KARNĀTAS

(1097 A. D.—1324 A. D.)

Since the break-up of the Videhan monarchy and the Vajjian confederacy the history of Mithilā had been a history of continuous defeats and subjugation. The light that shone eternally had been eclipsed by the enveloping darkness. Politically dormant aud culturally stagnant she lay prostrate and helpless. It was therefore, aftei a long spell—nearly about fourteen hundred years of trials and tribulations—that she rose again under the brave and inspiring leadership of Karṇāṭa Nānyadeva and asserted her independence. Thus, the foundation of the Karṇāṭa or the Simrāoṇ dynasty ushered in a new era—an "era of kingdom buiding"[1], an era of splendid glory and great achievements.

The Karṇāṭas—Their Origin

The founder of the Karṇāṭa dynasty or Simrāon dynasty—Nānyadeva was a Karṇāṭa kṣatriya, like his counterpart, the Senas in Bengal. The Madhāinagar Grant of Lakṣmaṇasena describes Sāmantasena as *'kula-śiromaṇi'*, *i. e.*, "head garland" of the Karṇāṭa kṣatriyas[2]. This

1. JBORS. IX. 300.
2. JASB. V (N. S.), 1909, p. 471.

shows that the Senas came form Karṇāṭa in the Deccan and settled down in Rāḍha in west Bengal. The Naihāṭi Grant of Ballālasena[1] probably points, though indirectly, to exactly the same conclusion. As with the Senas of Bengal, so with the Karṇāṭas of Mithilā. That Nānya originally belonged to the Karṇāṭa country and was himself a Karṇāṭa kṣatriya is amply proved by the express reference to him and his dynasty in the Nepalese chronicle or Vaṃśāvalis. This is further confirmed by his title '*Karṇāṭakula-bhūṣaṇa*'—a title very much similar to that of Sāmantasena—occurring in a versified Commentary of Bharata's Nāṭyaśāstra[2] which deals with music in all its aspects related to theatre[3]. The Commentary was composed by Nānya himself who gives his own opinions on various theories purporting to different aspects of music, under different names—Nānyapati, Nānya, *Mahāsāmantādhipati Dharmāvaloka, Dharmādhārabhūpati Mithileśa* and *Karṇāṭakulabhūṣaṇa*[4]. According to Jayaswal his name Nānya itself is not a Sanskrit word but a Sanskritised form of a word of Dravidian origin "Nanniya", which in Canarese means "affectionate", " true". Prince Gaṅga[5] is also called Nanniya Gaṅga in an inscription of the 10th century A. D.[6]. Moreover, the eleventh chapter of the

1. EI. XIV. 159.
2. Chapters XVIII—XXIX.
3. QJAHRS. I. 55-56.
4. The Colophons generally read: "इति महासामन्ताधिपति धर्मावलोक श्रीमन्नान्यपति विरचिते"
5. We should not confuse this Gaṅga with Nānya's son Gaṅgadeva. He was a prince of Karṇāṭaka.
6. JBORS. IX. 306 ; Levi, Le Nepal, II, 201 ; EI. III. 183.

Commentary by Nānyadeva describes all the *deśī-rāgas*, generally of Karṇāta type, betraying the nativity of the author[1]. The Deopārā inscription records that about the period when Nānyadeva was ruling in Mithilā, Bengal was conquered by Vijayasena, a scion of the Karṇāṭa race[2]. Thus "the Karṇāṭas had gained a prominent footing in the eastern part of Northern India towards the close of the 11th century A. D.".[3]

Different scholars have broached different theories as to the identity and coming of the Karṇāṭas. Various suggestions have been advanced explaining their sudden, rather quick unexpected intrusion, as a political factor, into Northern India. Jayaswal thinks that the Karṇāṭa settler, out of whom the Simrāon dynasty arose, was either a remnant of Rājendra Cola's army or more likely a remnant of the Karṇāṭa allies of Karṇa, the Cedī king, son of Gāṅgeyadeva and sovereign of Mithilā who overran nearly the whole of Mithilā about 1040—60 A. C. Jayaswal thus follows R. D. Banerji and accordingly believes that the Karṇāṭas were of Cola origin and that they had intruded into Northern India at the time of Rājendra Cola's expeditions[4]. Scholars have rejected this theory as "obsolete" and "entirely mistaken"[5]. Moreover, it does not find any mention in the second edition of R. D. Banerji's book, *Bāṅgalār Itihāsa*.

1. QJAHRS. I, 62.
2. EI. I. 307 . IHQ. VII. 681.
3. IHQ. VII. 681 ; also cf. Ibid. XXX. No. 3. pp. 206, 208-09.
4. R. D. Banerji, The Pālas of Bengal, 99 ; JBORS. IX. 306.
5. IHQ. VII. 681 ; ASJV. III, 560 ff ; DHNI. I, 316. fn. 3 & 4 ; Canda, Gauḍarājamālā, xi ; HAIB. 454-55 ; HB, I. 209.

According to M. Ramakrishna Kavi, the Rāṣṭrakūṭas were the Karṇāṭas. When their power declined in the Deccan in 970 A. D. they made a move towards the North and the East and established their dynasties in the new acquisitions till they were all finally swept away in the deluge of Muslim invasions in the 12th and 13th canturies A. D.[1]. This statement is vague and confused for he does not explain the causes of this movement on the part of the so-called "Rāṣṭrakūṭa cum-Karṇāṭas". What prompted them to move towards only North and East and not to some other direction, is a query which has got to be answered before accepting this theory. The only correct and most convincing answer to this comes from Sylvain Levi, who connects the rise of the Karṇāṭa power in North India with the victorious military expeditions of the Karṇāṭa emperors Someśvara I and his son Vikramāditya VI of the Cālukya dynasty, to which contemporary records bear ample evidence[2]. From Bilhaṇa's Vikramāṅkadeva-carita we learn that Someśvara I (1040-69 A. D.) stormed Dhāra, the capital of the Paramāras in Mālava from which king Bhoja had to flee away. His son Vikramāditya VI, after subduing Gauḍa and Kāmarūpa, led victorious expeditions against Northern India at least twice during his reign (A. D. 1088—89 and A. D. 1098[3]). It would thus appear that a series of Rāṣṭrakūṭa and Cālukya invasions of Northern India were certainly responsible for

1. QJAHRS. I, 57.
2. IHQ. VII. 683, HB. I. 209 ff.
3. IHQ. VII. 683; Bomb. Gaz. I. pt ii, 452.

a slow but steady flow of the Karnāṭa settlers into different parts of India, especially Magadha and Bengal[1].

In the latter part of the 11th century A. D. they were stirred into new activities, making a bid for political supremacy, with the decay and disintegration of the ruling authorities. It is also probable that the Cālukya invasion of Gauḍa by *Karṇāṭakendu* Vikramāditya VI, served as a new impetus to the ambitious chiefs[2]. The Nāgapur Praśasti of Vikramāditya records that the Karṇāṭas associated themselves with the Cedī king Karṇa, who, with their help, overran Mālava like a sea[3]. This alliance probably facilitated the movement that, soon after Karṇa's death, made the Karṇāṭa warrior Nānya, the ruler of Mithilā. The growth of the political power of the Karṇāṭa-kṣatriyas in Bengal dates from about the same period. Its founders (founders of the Sena dynasty) claimed to be the defenders of the "*Karṇāṭa-kula-Lakṣmī*" and declared themselves to be Southerners. It has also been suggested that they were first established on the borders of Bengal by an invasion of the Cālukya emperor Vikramāditya VI[4].

1. Kṣemeśvara's Candra-Kauśika says that king Mahipāla of the Pāla dynasty defeated one Karṇāṭa Rāja who had invaded Bengal, He may have been either Vijayasena or his predecessor;

"यः संश्रित्य प्रकृति गहनामार्य्या चाणक्यनीति हत्वानंदान् कुसुमनगरं चन्द्रगुप्तो जिणाय कर्णाटत्वं ध्रुवमुपगतानत्व तानेव हन्तुं दादेपीद्यः स पुनरभवत् श्री महीपालदेव: "

(cf. Bancrji, Bāṅgalār Itihāsa, I, p. 223, 1st. Ed.; Singh, 60, fn. 1).

2. IA., 1919, p. 114.
3. EI. II, 185.
4. HAIB. 456; Gauḍarājamālā. 47; JL. XVI. 7.

M. Ramakrishna Kavi raises another point. According to him Nānya was the brother of Kīrttirāja, whom we know from the Bodhagayā inscription of Tuṅga-Dharmāvaloka[1]. The donor is represented as the son of Kīrttirāja and the grandson of Nanna Guṇāvaloka, a Rāṣṭrakūṭa king. The significant word *'avaloka'* prompts him to identify Rāṣṭrakūṭa Kīrttirāja with the brother of Nānyadeva who is also described as *'śrī sāmantādhipati Dharmāvaloka śrīmannānyapati"*. We have no evidence to support this view. Had Nānya been a scion of the ruling Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty he would not have perhaps been referred to as simply *Mahāsāmantādhipati*, and his penegyrist Śrīdhara must have taken particular care to glorify his master's family in his inscription[2]. Śrīdhara no doubt glorifies his master, but makes no mention of his Rāṣṭrakūṭa origin. Besides, full reliance on a particular epithet given to a particular king belonging to a particular family or dynasty is, in our view, not always safe and very often disastrously misleading, more so when we come across petty kings crowning themselves with high sounding epithets to merely assume an air of "world conqueror" or "earth conqueror".

Some scholars suggest that besides the Senas, another of the adventurers was probably one of the forefathers of Nānyadeva[3]. This Southern adventurer must have

1. QJAHRS. I, 56-57.
2. cf. The Andharā-Thārhi inscription (in Madhubani Sub-division of Darbhanga) of Nānyadeva edited by Jayaswal in JBORS. IX 303 04.
3. DHNI. I. 203.

been a petty chief, serving under some ruling powers. He later overthrew his master and established his authority in Tirhut. This followed as a natural corollary to the invasion of Vikramāditya VI. It is significant to note that Nepal suddenly finds place into the composition of engravers or *praśastikāras* of the Deccan kings immediately from the time that followed the reign of Vikramāditya VI. The Pattadakal stone inscription dated in 1162 A. D. mentions Nepal among the vassal states of the Cālukya emperor Someśvara III. This region was actually conquered by Someśvara I and Vikramāditya VI[1]. The fact, however, remains that these Kalacurīs pushed up their conquest as far as Nepal and established their authority there. The Kalacurī Bijjala, who defeated and overthrew Tailapa III, the son of Someśvara III, is highly praised in an epigraph (c. 1200 A. D.) for having destroyed the stability of Nepal. We have yet another inscription of about the same time discovered at Managali, which represents Yādava Jaitugi (c. 1191–1210 A. D.) as having defeated the leaders of the armies of Nepal. It is, therefore, probable that the fore-fathers of Nānya established themselves as feudatory chiefs in Tirhut, on the border of Nepal, as a result of successive raids by the great Cālukya prince to the foot-hills of the Himālayan range. In course of time, probably just after the withdrawal of the strong Cālukya arms from these regions, they rose to pre-eminence, broke off their allegiance and established themselves as rulers of Tirhut. Nānya became the first sovereign ruler of

1. IHQ. VII. 682 ff. Also cf. QJMS. XLIV, pp. I ff; IHQ. XXX, No. 3, pp. 206. 208-09.

the territory and crowned himself with the epithets "*Mithileśvara*" and "*Karṇāṭakula-bhūṣaṇa*".

NANYADEVA—DATE AND ACCESSION

We have already shown that the Karṇāṭa dynasty was established in Mithilā in 1098 A.D. (or 1097 A.D.). Manmohan Chakravarti, howevei believes that the actual date was sometime in the 14th century, and the intervening period was the "dark period" of the Maithila history[1]. He rejects Keilhorn's date Śaka 1019 or 1097 A.D. as "merely a tradition lacking in authenticity" and dismisses the account of Nānya's conquest of Nepal, furnished by the Nepal Vaṃśāvalis[2], as "equally unreliable"[3]. His sweeping remarks, however, prove that he had no occasion to notice the memorable verses engraved on the stone-pillar of the fort built by Nānya himself in Simrāon near Tirhut-Nepal border, which has been reproduced by the late Paṇḍita Candā Jhā in his edition of the Puruṣa-Parīkṣā of Vidyāpati[4]. The verse runs as follows: "In the Śaka year 1019 (1097 A.D.) on Saturday, the 7th of *śrāvaṇa* in the *svāti-nakṣatra* king Nānyadeva took the land"[5]. In the Nepal

1. JASB. (N. S.), 1915, p, 407.
2. IA. IX. 188.
3. JASB. (N. S.) 1915, 409.
4. Darbhanga edition, p. 19.
5. The original verse reads as follows :
"नन्देन्दुबिन्दुविधुसम्मितशाकवर्षे सच्छ्रावणे सितदले मुनिसिद्धितिथ्याम्
स्वा (ती) तौ शनैश्चरदिने करिवैरिलग्ने श्रीनान्यदेवनृपतिर्व्यदधीत वास्तुम् "
Sylvain Levi reads the verse with a slight variation (Vide-Le Nepal, II, 194)

Vaṃśāvalis, according to Jayaswal, the date has been missed owing to the reading of the first line, becoming corrupt as 901 (Kirkpatrick) and 811 (Bhagwanlal Indraji[1]). The primary mistake arose due to reading from left to right, instead of doing it from right to left, as required in reading figures put in equivalents (" *Aṅkānāṃ vāmatogatiḥ* "). The date of Harisiṃha is, however, correctly given (1324 A. D.), and also the correctly recorded intervening peried, *i. e.*, 226 years (219 years assigned to the rule of Thākurīs in Nepal and 7 years of anarchy) brings us much nearer the correct date (1324-226 = 1098 A. D.). Moreover, this period of 226 years exactly corresponds to the Maithila datum of 226 years for the interval between Nānya's accession and the invasion of Nepal by Harisiṃhadeva. This evidently shows that the date-memorial is a Maithila datum adopted by Nepal. Another evidence contained in the Nepal document, *i. e.*, the drama-*Muditakuvalayāśva* (1628 A.D.) by Jagajjyotirmalla, king of Bhaṭagāon claiming to be a descendant of Harisiṃhadeva, records the date as follows—"*Navendu-kha—candrayukte śāke*" corresponding to 18th July 1097, verified to have been a Saturday in the *svāti-nakṣatra*[2]. This date is thus corroborated by the Maithila datum as well as the known historical facts of the time. The tendency to denounce local traditions without trying to find out their correctness is unwise and regrettable. The discovery of the MSS. by Prof. Bendall[3] and a versified

1. JBORS. IX. 305; Levi, Le Nepal, II, 194.
2. JBORS. IX. 305.
3. JASB. 1903. p. 1.

Commentary of Bharata's Nāṭyaśāstra (referred to above) by Nānya himself leave no doubt as to the date finally settled[1].

Local traditions relating to Nānyadeva's accession to the throne are very interesting. In fact, they read more like fairy-tales than a piece of sober history. They are invariably repeated in almost all the non-historical treatises written by Maithila scholars. The most popular of all traditions runs as follows—Nānya formerly ruled in the Deccan over the Nilgiri region. This was the time when Mahamūd Gazani attacked the Deccan. Having been fed up with the constant Muslim invasions, their cruelty and plunder he left his kingdom with some of his officers, relations and subjects; reached Pāṭaliputra; thence advanced towards Mithilā; reached Koilī village (near Puparī in the Nānyapura paraganā of the present Muzaffarpur district) and encamped there. One day he noticed a serpent near his tent or hut, on whose raised hoof was written something which he could not read himself. He called in a local Paṇḍita. The Paṇḍita unfolded the mystery before him by narrating the following verse, written on the serpent's hoof—"*Rāmovetti, Nalovetti,*

1. Dr. K. C. Pandey has pointed out that as Abhinavagupta refers to Nānyadeva and quotes a passage from his Commentary, this Nānyadeva must have flourished before 1014-15 A.D., the date of one of Abhinavagupta's works (Vide—Abhinavagupta, An Historical and Philosophical Study, pp. 121-23). The point undoubtedly requires further investigation. We, however, know that no other Nānya, king of Mithilā belonging to the Karṇāṭa family, is known to us. We have, therefore, accepted the identity of the two and fixed his date on the basis of more reliable data (cf. HB. I, 212. fn. 2).

Vettirājā Pururavā, Alarkasya dhanaṃ prāpya Nānyo rājā bhaviṣyati " (*i.e.*, Nānya would get possession of the vast wealth accumulated and preserved by Alarka, and by virtue of his wealth he would become the king of Mithilā, to which Rāma, Nala-Pururavā bear witness). Meanwhile, the serpent disappeared. This unexpected turn of events worked tremendously on his mind ; he dug the earth and recovered the vast treasure hidden beneath, and became the king of Mithilā.[1] Whether this tradition bears any semblance to historical truth, it is very difficult to ascertain. That Nānya was formerly a king of the Deccan is not attested by any evidences. That he so easily reached Mithilā, got innumerable wealth just by accident and became the ruler of Tirhut, without facing any opposition or resistance from any quarters seems in the logic of history utterly fantastic and wide the mark. The tradition is all but a myth corroborated neither by literary accounts nor by epigraphic evidences. Even Śrīdhara, Minister of Nānyadeva and his *praśastikāra*, does not give any inkling of it in his *praśasti* of Nānya, known as the Andhrā Thārhī inscription.[2] No Vidyāpati, or any other story-teller bases the theme of his story on this memorable event of Nānya's life.

1. P. Jha, Mithilā-tatva-vimarśa (Maithilī), 97 ; M. Jha, Mithilā-bhāṣāmaya-Itihāsa (Maithilī), 460-70.
   Also cf. Bihari Lal, Ain-i-Tirhut (printed at the Bahar Kashemiri Press, Lucknow), pp. 10-11 ; IA. 1880, No. 18 ; C. M. Duff, Chronology of India (1899 Ed.), p. 169 ; Singh, p. 60, fn. 5 ; Hunter, Statistical Account of Bengal, Tirhut & Camparan, 1877. p. 253.
2. JBORS. IX. 303-4.

It, therefore, appears quite probable that after Nānya's accession to the throne, his victories inspired some royal composer to scribble this verse, which in the course of time got widely circulated among the local population, partly because of its mythical appeal and legendary character and partly because of its association with the name of a king, who, though an alien to the land, came to be highly regarded by his subjects for his persuit for and patronage of Sanskrit learning. It was probably this finer element in him that ultimately became responsible for the growth of numerous legendary tales woven round his unique personality.

That Nānya was a feudatory chief in the beginning of his career is further confirmed by his epithets in his own Commentary (*śrī mahāsāmantādhipati* ..*śrīman-Nānya-pati*)[1]. The use of this title further shows that Nānya had been a feudatory chief or viceroy of some king before he assumed the position of an independent sovereign [2] In the body of the Commentary he refers to himself as "*Mithileśvara*" and "*Karṇāṭakula-bhūṣaṇa*", "*Dharmādhārabhūpati*", "*Rājanārāyaṇa*", *Nṛpamalla*", '*Mohana-murāri*", and "*Pratyagravānipati*". Thus, the titles used in the colophon and those in the body of the Commentary probably point to his two distinct status. It may be suggested that he served as a *sāmantādhipati* under some ruling authority—possibly under his Cālukya masters, *i.e.*, Someśvara I, Vikramāditya VI, and Someśvara III, whose constant raids on Northern India facilitated the way to his

1. QJAHRS. I, 55-56 ; The Andhrā-Thārhi inscription also refers to him as "श्रीमान्" (JBORS. IX, 303).
2. IHQ. VII. 680.

kingly attainment at-the time, he started writing the book; and by the time he finished his work he had asserted his independent status. Hence the epithets "*Mithileśvara*" and '' *Karṇāṭakula-bhūṣaṇa*.'' The continuance of his title "*sāmantādhipati*" even afterwards may account for just a nominal allegiance on his part to his erstwhile masters—either out of gratitude or to keep up the imperial halo. It was a common tactics adopted by the *sāmantādhipatis* and *Mahāsāmantādhipatis* to rule in the name of the Imperial kings (*i. e*, their former masters) even though the latter had no hold or suzerainty over the former. This is evident in the cases of the Nepalese king Aṃśuvarman, and Puṣyamitra, the Śuṅga, who is always mentioned as *Senāpati* in epigraphic records[1] though the usurpation of the Magadhan throne by him is well known to the students of Indian history. This practice seems to have been rampant to deluge the general mass, and put on the mantle of the hollow imperial glory and dignity. It was probably actuated by these timely considerations that Nānya also used such vague and varying epithets.

WARS AND CONQUESTS

Side by side with Mithilā there came into existence three more states—the Gaṅga Kingdom of Orissa under Coḍa Gaṅga, the Sena Kingdom in Bengal under Vijayasena and the Gāhaḍavāla Kingdom of Kanauj-Banaras under Śrī Candradeva Gāhaḍavāla[2]. Compared to the other

1. cf. PHAI[6]. 371, fn. 5.
2. IHQ. XXX, 206-09.

states the Maithila kingdom was a tiny one hemmed in by four powerful states—Nepal, Bengal, the Pāla kingdom of southern Bihar and Kanauj-Kāśī. She faced a perpetual threatening from the Cedī king of Tripurī who formerly exercised his sway over this territory and whose dominions had by now extended right upto the south-west Bihar and Banaras[1]. It was very difficult for Nānya to escape unburnt while the flames were raging all around. But, he seems to have maintained "his position and the individuality of Mithilā" by virtue of his shrewd diplomacy and fighting genius. From the Bherīghāṭa inscription of Alhaṇadevī[2] it appears that the Cedī Yaśaḥ Karṇa, son of Karṇa, the "Hindu Nepolean", having broken the Gāhaḍavāla barrier of Banaras, reached as far as Campārana and devastated it. According to Jayaswal, this eventwould have taken place "only when Mithilā had ceased to be the part of his own kingdom and had already passed to Nānyadeva"[3]. His attempt, however, was only a sporadic raid, which proved abortive. It was probably after the recovery of Banaras in 1122 A. D. that the Cedī king measured his sword with his enemy Nānya to recover his lost dominion of Mithilā. From the tone and texture of the above inscription it may be concluded that, though the "devastation" was complete, "victory" was lost-- either due to Candradeva's possession over Banaras or Nānya's "effective" check. Yaśaḥ Karṇa failed in his mission, and his final exit from the scene

1. JBORS. IX. 301.
2. EI. II, 2 : "चम्पारण्य विदारणोद्गतयशः"
3. JBORS. IX. 301.

of Banaras was augmented in c. 1124--25 A. D. With his retreat Cedī claim over Mithilā died out for ever[1].

We have a contemporary record of Śrīdhara, known as the Andhrā--Thārhī inscription found in the village of Andhrā-Thārhī in the Madhubani sub-division (Darbhanga) inscribed on the pedestal of an image of Viṣṇu—designated here as Śrīdhara—established by Śrīdhara, the minister of Nānya. As the tradition goes, this Śrīdhara, a Kāyastha by caste, was the Prime Minister of Gaṅgadeva, son of Nānyadeva. This shows that Śrīdhara probably served under both the father and the son respectively. The orthography of this inscription may be compared with that of the Deopārā inscription. Certain letters in the first line and 4th line are obliterated[2]. This is the only historical record of his time. Evidences contained in the inscription are vague, and not quite refreshing. We are told that Nānya was treated by his contemporaries as "Kṣatriya". He is also described as the "lord", the victor. (*śrīmān Nānyapatirjjettā*). Besides his "extraordinary achievements", he is said to have "turned the world into a second kṣīrasāgara" by his fame[3].

1. According to local tradition Nānya had also established the seat of his Government in Campāran, known as Nānya (pa)-pura or Nanha (na)-pura, after his name in 1097 A. D. Its ruins are yet extant and they are regarded as an object of curiosity and respect by the village-folks. A huge palace was built there and the memorable verse "**Nandendu vinduvidhu** . . ." was inscribed on the main entrance of this palace. See also M. Jha, Mithilā-bhāṣāmaya Itihāsa, 461; Behari Lal, Ain-i-Tirhut, 10-11; Annals, XXXV, 93-94.
2. JBORS. IX. 303-04.
3. "यत्-कीर्त्या जनितं विश्वं, द्वितीय क्षीरसागर" (1st line-JBORS. IX, 303).

The date of the inscription is 1097 A. D. referred to above. It throws no light on the condition of N. E. India. Nānya's Commentary, however, represents him as having defeated the heroes of Sauvīra[1] and Mālava[2] and broken up the power of Gauḍa and Bengal kings[3]. He is further referred to as "*Pratyagravānipati*". The theory of the conquest of Nānyadeva over the Mālavas and Sauvīras finds some support in the above statements, for Mālava was certainly among the countries conquered by Karṇa—the conquest having been made over about fifty years before the accession of Nānyadeva. But Nānya, being a *sāmantādhipati* to start with, "could not have possibly been a leader of the Karnāṭas who accompanied Karṇa about 50 years before his accession". According to R. C. Majumdar the long reign of 50 years assigned to Nānyadeva renders the view quite untenable[4]. The rise of the Karṇāṭas in North India as a result of the victorious military campaigns by the Karnāṭa emperors (Someśvara I and Vikramāditya VI); their alleged supremacy of Bengal, Bihar and Nepal and the title "*Mahāsāmantādhipati*" assumed by Nānyadeva (actually applied to the viceroys and governors of Vikramāditya VI) are enough to explain the victories by Nānya over Mālava and Sauvīra, as enumerated in the Commentary. We have

1. "जित सौवीर वीरेण सौवीरक उदहृत:" (QJAHRS. I, 56, fn. Ie).
2. "लुप्त मालवभूपालकीर्तिमलिनपङ्कमीम्" (Ibid).
3. "बांगालिकेति कथिता मिथिलेश्वरेण" (Ibid, fn. I f).

"श्रीरागर्यैकमूमिलंलितमधुरवाग्भिन्न बंगाल-गौड़, प्रौढ़प्राग्भारसार: ककुभमुभयथा साधयन्निश्रमुच्चै:, संग्रामे भैरवो य: प्रविलसति मुहुर्धूर्जटीयस्य कण्ठे, सौवीरो ध्यायमोनं व्यथित कृतमतिर्भूपतिर्नान्यदेव" (Ibid, 57, fn 3).

4. IHQ. VII. 682.

references to Vikramāditya VI's conquest over the rulers on the Northern side of the Narmadā river (*i. e.*, Mālava, Sauvīra, etc.). It is probable that Nānyadeva as a mere "*sāmantādhipāti*" accompanied Vikramāditya in one or more of his victorious campaigns and "hence took the credit for victories in wars against those countries", for "otherwise it is impossible to believe that as a ruler of Mithilā he could have carried his arms so far to the west, with such powerful neighbours to his immediate west and south-west [1]".

As regards his victories against Gauḍa and Vaṅga, we have evidences of interesting nature. The Deopārā inscription of Vijayasena describes Nānya as a "defeated hero"[2]. Scholars have usually taken it to refer to an aggressive invasion of Mithilā by Vijayasena. But, as the evidences furnished by the Commentary suggest, the root of the dissensions between the two Karṇāṭa kings probably lay in their desire for domination over Gauḍa and Vaṅga. At the time of Nānya's accession to the throne of Mithilā the political condition of Bengal was such as to easily tempt a foreign invader. The suppression of the Kaivarta revolt by Rāmapāla and his re-occupation of Varendrī had necessarily unsettled the Gauḍa country. A new dynasty, that of the Varmanas held eastern Bengal. The Senas were a rising power in Rāḍha and south-west Bengal. Besides, several petty chiefs had sprung up all over the country, enjoying either full or limited independence. It is, therefore, quite plausible that Nānya, after having

1. Ibid. VII. 685.
2. EI. I. 305 (verse 20).

settled himself in northern Bihar, would turn his attention towards Gauḍa and Vaṅga (north and eastern Bengal). The Senas also nourished the same ambition in exactly the same direction. And, hence the inevitable clash. It is therefore, futile to assume, as suggested by some scholars, that these two Karṇāṭa chiefs formerly acted in concert with each other but later, they fell out over the distribution of the booty or " each wanted to leave him alone in what he regarded as his own sphere of influence "[1]. There were thus two streams of Karṇāṭa invasion-one from north-west and another from south-west under the leadership of Nānya and Vijayasena respectively, overwhelming the whole of Bengal. But, Nānya failed in his mission.

Jayaswal holds that Nānya allied himself with the Gāhaḍavāla kings against the Senas, and that the Pālas in south Bihar also joined this confederacy against the rising power of the Senas[2]. Jayaswal's theory is evidently based on that of R. D. Banerji who believed that Lakṣmaṇasena ascended the throne in 1119 A. D. Banerji also maintained that Lakṣmaṇasena died before 1170 A. D.[3], which would hardly be compatible with Jayaswal's view that " it was in the time of Nānya's grandson Narasiṃhadeva (1174–1205 A. D.) that Mithilā leaned towards the Sena power and it would be then that the Lakṣmaṇasena era would come into vogue in Mithilā"[4]. The old theory of the late R. D, Banerji has been thoroughly discarded and the probable

1. Ibid. VII. 686.
2. JBORS. X. 44 ff.
3. The Pālas of Bengal. 103.
4. JBORS. X. 46. Also see Rāma-carita, IV. 20; IHQ. VII. 685.

dates of accession of the first three kings of the Sena dynasty laid down with a fair degree of certainty--Vijayasena (1095 A. D.); Ballālasena (1159 A. D.), and Lakṣmaṇasena (1178 A.D.)[1]. In the light of this date of Lakṣmaṇasena, Jayaswal's theory is hardly tenable. While, the rivalry between the Senas and the Gāhaḍavālas is undoubtedly a historical fact, there seems no reason or evidence to connect either the Pālas or Nānyadeva with this struggle.

Jayaswal's view of Gāhaḍavāla-Nānyadeva-alliance, *i.e.*, Gāhaḍavāla Govindacandra's influence on either Nānya towards the close of his reign or more probably his successor Gaṅgadeva is chiefly based on two facts: (1) the law-book, Kalpataru prepared and compiled by the foreign minister of Govindacandra at his command became the ruling authority in Mithilā under the dynasty of Nānyadeva, and (2) Malladeva, a son of Nānyadeva served in the army of Jayacandra Gāhaḍavāla. Added to these is the fact of dominion over Monghyr or Mudgagiri in Govindacandra's reign, coupled with the struggle for western Bihar between the Senas and the Gāhaḍavālas.[2] Regarding his first contention we have no other evidences to support it. Govindacandra is nodoubt represented as having pushed his arms upto Mudgagiri or Monghyr which, as one of his inscriptions[3] records, even passed into the hands of the Gāhaḍavālas.

1. IHQ. VII. 687; III. 186, 594; V. 133; IA. 1922, pp. 145 ff; JASB., 1921, pp. 7 ff.
2. JBORS. IX. 309-10.
3. EI. VII. 98-99.

About the time of Madanapāla and Govindapāla, however, practically the whole of Bengal seems to have been lost to the Senas. It seems that Govindapāla succeeded Madanapāla only over some districts of South Bihar. Even then the Pālas were not quite safe. The Maner plates of Govindacandra[1] dated 1124 A. D. show that the Gāhaḍavālas of Banaras and Kanauj advanced as far as the Patna district. The Lār plates[2] of 1146 A. D. point to the occupation of Mudgagiri or Monghyr, referred to above. The Jayanagar inscription (near Luckeesarai in the Monghyr district) of the 14th regnal year of Madanapāla corresponding to 1157-58 A. D., and other records may point to his temporary success in the struggle with the Gāhaḍavālas[3]. Madanapāla though recovered Monghyr from the Gāhaḍavālas he had soon to reckon with the newly established Karṇāṭas of Mithilā. In west Bengal the Senas had come to power. The invasion of these Karṇāṭa rulers, therefore, kept him busy and finally extinguished the Pāla power in Bengal. Madanapāla continued to rule over a part of Bihar till his death about 1160 A. D.[4].

Thus, we have no solid proof to justify the relation that Govindacandra and Nānyadeva bore to each other. Dissemination of some law-books prepared or some ideas propounded by some author belonging to one country, in some other, is no surer proof to infer that one country was under the influence of another. Books or ideas know no

1. JASB. XVIII. 81.
2. EI. VII. 98.
3. JASB, XVII., 1951, No. 1. p. 29.
4. Majumdar, Ancient India, 339.

barriers and they easily and unnoticingly transgress the passage by virtue of their grandeur and spontaneous popularity. To build up historical facts on such hypothetical grounds would be simply misleading and hazardous.

Jayaswal's second contention is chiefly based on a story by Vidyāpati in *Puruṣa-Parīkṣā*[1]. According to him Malladeva was killed in war only when he was 16[2]. We know that Jayacandra ascended the throne in 1170 A.D. Malladeva could not have been born before 1170 A.D. if Vidyāpati's story is to be believed. In that case the date of Nānyadeva's death would have to be placed after 1154 A. D., which would mark his reign-period to have been of nearly 60 years, far more than the longest period assigned to him in Vaṃśāvalis[3]. And here we have but reasonable doubts as to the truth of Vidyāpati's story, at least in all its details[4]. Moreover, the way Vidyāpati has narrated his story it seems based on legend of which he, too, does not feel sure. This Mallavadeva does not appear to have served under Jayacandra, and the story should not be given much credence.

On the other hand, Vijayasena seems to have inflicted check upon Nānyadeva's further advance. If the statement contained in the Deopārā inscription is to be believed, Nānya was even taken prisoner by Vijayasena[5]. This

1. Ed. Grierson (The Test of Man), p. 13.
2. cf. JASB. 1915 (N. S.). p. 408.
3. IA. 1844, 414 ff.
4. IHQ. VII. 688, fn. 2; HK. 299-322; Annals, XXXV, 96 ff. (cf. R. K. Choudhary's article on 'The Karṇāṭas of Mithilā').
5. Verse 21.

serious reverse on the part of Nānya must have terribly upset his ambitious schemes and shattered all his hopes, leaving the field free for the two mighty combatants—the Senas and the Gāhaḍavālas. The Deopārā inscription also records that Vijayasena sent a flotilla of boats along with the Gaṅgā with a view to conquering the western regions.[1] This, in the opinion of Dr. Majumdar, could not have been possible, had not the ruler of Mithilā been rendered incapable of rising against him[2]. Majumdar's contention is further supported by a piece of evidence furnished us by a Maithila scholar[3]. According to this information Nānya was not only defeated in the battle against Vijayasena but was also kept as a prisoner in Gaṇḍeśvaragarh in Gaṇḍeśvara fort (Darbhanga). Mithilā also came to be dominated by Vijayasena for a time and was freed from the yoke of the Senas only when Gaṅgadeva, son of Nānyadeva, organised a formidable force against the enemy and recovered his kingdom. The latter contention seems rather exaggerated for, should the subjugation of Mithilā by the Senas have been a reality, Umāpatidhara,[4]

1. Verse 22.
2. IHQ, VII. 687-88.
3. M. Jhā, Mithilā-tatva-vimarśa, 100-01 ; Mithilā-mihira (Mithilāṅka). 1936, pp. 65-66. also cf. Rahmani, 'Mithilā', dated 2nd February. 1953, p. 6; Annals, XXXV. 94 ff.
4. Poet Jayadeva also refers to Umapatidhara in his "Gīta-Govinda" as "one of the five jewels" of the court of Lakṣmaṇasena : "वाच:पल्लवयत्युमापतिधर: । स्यातोगोवर्धनाचार्यं उमापतिधरस्तथा: । शरणोजयदेवश्चघोयींकविनृप: क्रमात् । राज्ञो लक्ष्मणसेनस्य पञ्चरत्नानि संसदि ।" This Umapatidhara was also the writer of the famous Deopara inscription.

a poet of eminence and the author of the Deopārā inscription would, in no case, have missed this significant event to record in eloquent terms Save the reference to Nānya's defeat by Vijayasena we have nothing as such in this inscription. Nānya's defeat, however, stands unquestioned, partly because the above candid statement comes from local scholars, who otherwise must have nourished prejudices against the enemy and partly because the statement is substantially corroborated by the evidences recorded in the Deopārā inscription.

From the above accounts it is clear that Vijayasena came into conflict with Nānyadeva and with certain powers of the West against whom he led a naval expedition. It is, however, difficult to believe that he had any appreciable success against Nānya whose successors were ruling over Mithilā for a long time to come.[1] Some scholars suggest that the comparative obscurity of Nānyadeva's successors and the popularity of the *Lakṣmaṇasena-Saṃvat* in Mithilā point to Sena-success in North Bihar. Both these arguments are, however, weak. The first is untenable as we have a chain of successors of Nānyadeva ruling over Mithilā. The second one is disputed. "The epoc of the La-Saṃ," according to D. C. Sircar, "falls in the period 1107–19 A. D., long before Lakṣmaṇasena's accession. It could have been associated with the Sena kings only if it is possible to think of a popular confusion. Such a confusion is, however, not improbable in view of the fact that the La-Saṃ. is associated with an imperial ruler named Lakṣmaṇasena, while only one such ruler of Eastern India is known to history. But even if it is believed that it was

1. IHQ. XXX. p. 209, fn. 3.

the Sena king Lakṣmaṇasena who founded the La-Saṃ. of Mithilā it may only suggest his own connection with the area, and not his ancestors."[1] Moreover, the author of the Deopārā inscription carefully weighs his every word that he has used in the *praśasti*. He does not deliberately use the word 'conquered" in describing Vijayasena's compaign against Nānya and other kings. He merely says "assailed" or "defeated." The position is made more clear with regard to Nānya and Rāghava. The verse clearly states that he humbled the pride of Nānya and Rāghava and "no territorial expansion is probably implied even though a serious defeat might have been inflicted."[2] H. C. Ray[3] is, however, inclined to include Nānya and Rāghava among "imprisoned princes" referred to in verse 21. The poet no doubt describes the prison-house being resounded with the voices of the imprisoned princes, but it does not categorically induce any evidence of Nānya and Rāghava's imprisonment.[4] We may, therefore, conclude that inspite of his alleged resounding victories the kings enjoyed their territories, suffering not the least.

It, therefore, appears that the Senas steadily persued their scheme of western expansion, but they could not "reap any immediate success", due to the strong arms of the Gāhaḍavāla Govindacandra. But the latter's death offered the Senas a splendid opportunity which seems to have been fully availed of by Lakṣmaṇasena, who "planted

1. Ibid.
2. JBORS. XXV. pts. iii—iv. 133.
3. DHNI. I, 358.
4. JBORS. XXV, pts. iii-iv. 133.

pillars of victory" at Banaras and Prayāga, sometime between 1180 and 1190 A. D. During the whole of this period the rulers of Mithilā—Nānya and his successors were negligible factors in North Indian politics. Even their policy of expansion towards Nepal "did not meet with great success." According to M. Sylvain Levi, "Nānya and his immediate successors exercised but real authority in that country. They remained as local rulers of Tirhut with Simrāon as their capital."[1]

It was perhaps after the failure of his mission in the east that Nānya switched over to the Nepalese region. It seems, when he was just on the look-out for a suitable opportunity to execute his Northern military plans, the Śivadeva-episode of Nepal served as a momentum, inviting his aggression. This Śivadeva was a successful pretender of the Nayakoṭa branch of the Thākurīs, who were ousted by the Pāṭan branch sometime before 1080-88 A. D. The internal dissensions had tragically shattered the imperial fabric of Nepal and tempted Nānyadeva to exploit this chaotic state of affairs. Nānyadeva acted promptly. He espoused the cause of Śivadeva and influenced his power in the valley. According to a Nepalese tradition, he captured the whole of Nepal from his capital at Simrāon after dethroning the two local Nepalese princes, Jayadevamalla of Pāṭan and Kāṭhamāṇḍū, and Ānandamalla of Bhaṭagāon[2]. Simrāon from now on formed the main

1. Le Nepal. II, pp. 205-19 ; IHQ. VII. 689 ; DHNI. I, 206.
2. JBORS. XXII. 256, 204 ; Le Nepal, II, 199 ff ; ABORI. 1942, pp. 299 ff.

capital of the rulers of this dynasty[1], and Nānyapura, their former capital-seat, seems to have been deserted, as we have no mention of it, associated with either later traditions or with any other documents.

From the dates in the colophon of the *Vaṃśāvali* it appears that Nānya did not destroy the local princes ruling over the valley. They were probably allowed to rule under the hegemony of the Karṇāṭas of Mithilā, *i.e.*, Nānyadeva and his successors. The epigraphic and literary traditions of Nepal simply present the list of his successors, nothing more, nothing less. The Kāṭhamāṇḍū inscription of Pratāpamalladeva (Saṃ. 769, A. D. 1649) gives us the following list—Nānyadeva, Gaṅgadeva, Nṛsiṃhadeva, Rāmasiṃha, Śaktisiṃha, Bhūpālasiṃha, and Harisiṃha.[2] As regards this list our authorities are in substantial agreement. Minor variations, of course, occur here and there. The omission of Śaktikumāra (Śaktisiṃha) and the addition of Harisiṃha in the prologue of the drama *Muditakuvalayāśva*, and that of Harideva by the chronicles of Wright and Bhagwanlal are but few glaring instances of it.[3] Besides, the forms of names, Bhavasiṃhadeva and Narasiṃhadeva as given in the drama, instead of Bhūpālasiṃha and Nṛsiṃha of the inscription, are a peculiarity to take note of. Apart from the orders of variations, the years of reign-periods assigned to the various princes ruling before Harisiṃhadeva, the last

1. The ruins of Simrāon still exist in Nepalese low-lands, about 15 miles from the base of the hills in the Nepalese district of Rotahat, and opposite to Camparan district of Bihar
2. IA. IX. 184-87, 189 91.
3. DHNI. I. 206.

king of the line, considerably vary and conflict with those given in or deduced from other sources. We have 219 or 266 years as the total reign-period of these kings which is nearly the exact period that intervened between Nānyadeva (1097 or 1098 A. D.) and Harisiṃhadeva (c. 1324 A. D.). It appears that there were two sets of kings ruling continuously and separately in Nepal and Tirhut as shown in the Kāṭhamāṇḍū inscription of Pratāpamalladeva, which records the name of Harisiṃha last of all. We have no further activities of Nānya in Nepal. Traditions, too, completely fail us in recording any notable achievements to their credit. It can, therefore, be safely concluded that these kings claimed but just "a loose sort of hegemony over the local princes of Nepal valley" from their capital at Simrāon.[1]

1. D. R Regmi believes that Nānya had not a peaceful time in Nepal and he could not subjugate the entire valley. Nānya occupied the Nepal valley for the second time in 1141 A. D. (Vide—Ancient & Medieval Nepal, 144-46). He further adds that Nānya's dynasty with the exception of the founder was not in possession of Nepal throne until 1314 A. D. As soon as Nānya's powerful hands were withdrawn, the scion of the Thākurī dynasty re-estabiished and began to rule from Kāṭhamāṇḍū (Ibid, 146).

   His contention that Nānya lost his dominion in Nepal and re-conquered it in 1141 A. D. and lost it again in 1147 A.D. as his kingdom in Mithilā was threatened from Kanauj is unwarranted on the basis of the evidences available to us. It is possible that local chiefs established their independence after Nānya. They, however. acknowledged the suzarainty of his successors, probably loosely. Harisiṃha later established his effective control over Nepal (Also cf. Annals, XXXV, 98 fn. 2, 97-98).

Nānya died in c. 1147-50 A. D., probably after a reign-period of 50-54 years, when Govindacandra Gāhaḍavāla was still pushing on eastwards.

Nānya, the state-maker, was one of the unique personalities of his time, like Candradeva Gāhaḍavāla, Madanapāla of Bengal, Yaśaḥ Karṇa, Govindacandra and Vijayasena most of whom were "both great by rise and great by fall." He had literally raised a country out of dust, and this was undoubtedly his crowning achievement. "A life amidst political storms and earth-quakes"[1], he tided over them all and infused the sparkling fire of life into an otherwise dead Maithila state. Reverses he had certainly met with, but they did not in the least effect his original creation or dwarf his genius. They only served as a check on his highly ambitious military mission. Moreover, his patronage of scholars and respect for Sanskrit learning and art revived once more the ancient glory of Mithilā. A great warrior, he was also a past-master in the art of music which his Commentary, referred to above, so eloquently speaks of. Mithilā once more, under his leadership, came to be duly honoured as "the home of the enlightened".

MALLADEVA

Nānyadeva had two sons—Malladeva and Gaṅgadeva. Malladeva may be treated as "a forgotten king of Mithilā". His identity is wrapped up in obscurity. We have one inscription in his name still lying unnoticed in village Bhīṭha-Bhagawanpur in Jhanjharpur thana of

1. JBORS. X. 46.

Darbhanga district. The ruins are yet there lying uncared-for. Fine specimens of sculptures containing images of Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa, Gaṇeśa, Sūrya etc. are kept in a thatched house, unprotected and unnoticed. A set of two representations of men and women in embrace in relief on the door-frame is there. The sculpture represents the Karṇāṭa tradition of black stone of the 12th cent. A. D. The voluptuous sensuousness in the sculptures fittingly found its expression in Vidyāpati's love-lyrics. The inscription on the pedestal of Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa image reads : "*Oṃ śrī Malladevasya*".[1] Folk-tales state that this Bhiṭha-Bhagawanpur was the capital of Malladeva.

Vidyāpati says that Malladeva was a valiant warrior.[2] He went to Jayacandra, king of Kanauj; had some differences with him, left Kanauj and went to Chikkor king. There broke out a struggle between the kings of Kanauj and Chikkor.[3] The Chikkors of Pithi were feudal chieftains. Malladeva is said to have been the cause of this struggle. Nothing definite, however, can be ascertained about Malladeva on the basis of such evidences.

1. I have seen the place personally. The inscription consists of two to three lines, but only a part is intelligible. The rest is too obliterated to render decipherment possible.
2. Puruṣa-parīkṣā, 1. 3.
3. The Chikkors belonged to the kingdom of Pithi which was at one time a very important kingdom in north-eastern India. Scholars are divided about the exact location of Pithi. For different views cf. Banerji, Pālas of Bengal, 86-89 ; JASB. 1904. pt. i, 178, note 1 ; Raichaudhuri, Studies in Indian Antiquities, 159-67 ; JBORS. IV. 273 ; IA. XLVIII. (1919), 43 ; IC. V. 379 ; Saṃdhyākara Nandi's Commentary on Rāmacarita, V, 5, Chap. II & etc.

There is yet another tradition which asserts that one of Nānya's son ruled in Nepal. That Gaṅgadeva immediately succeeded Nānya is a historical fact. The other king who ruled in Nepal may, therefore, be identical with Malladeva who, in addition to Nepal, also ruled over the eastern portion of Mithilā. Tradition also says that Gaṅgadeva and Malladeva were not on good terms. Malladeva never helped his brother Gaṅgadeva. So, the division of Nānya's kingdom between the two brothers is not very unlikely. Gaṅgadeva, therefore, turned his attention towards Bengal which was then in a process of political disintregation. The Karṇāṭas of Mithilā, therefore, forced the Senas to push eastwards. This is evident from the establishments of two settlements : Gaṅgāpura after Gaṅgadeva in Madhipura sub-division and Malladihī after Malladeva in Purneā district.[1]

We are also told that one Vardhamāna Upādhyāya was patronised by Malladeva. This Vardhamāna was a distinguished writer on Smṛti and flourished between 1150 and 1250 A. D. The second Vardhamāna was the famous author of Daṇḍa-viveka and he flourished probably in the 15th century. The Dekuli image near Laheriasarai is known as Śiva-Vardhamāneśvara which is said to have been established by one Vardhamāna, employee of Malladeva.

Bhīṭha-Bhagwanpur is said to have been the capital of Malladeva. The border of Nepal territory falls within 35 or 40 miles from there and "it seems probable that Malladeva ruled the eastern portion of Tirhut and some portion

1. Annals, xxxv. 101.

of Nepal." The inscription needs further investigation. The door frames there speak of the magnificent buildings buried within the vicinity of that village. It is, however, very difficult to arrive at any conclusion in the present state of our knowledge.[1]

GANGADEVA

Nānyadeva's son Gaṅgadeva ascended the throne in c. 1147 A. D. The Nepal Vaṃśāvali assign him a reign-period of 41 years while the local tradition allots only 14 years. According to the latter, Nānyadeva ruled only for 36 years and Gaṅgadeva succeeded him in 1134 A. D.[2]. Jayaswal accepts the reign-period of 50 years, alloted to Nānya in the Vaṃśāvali, quoted by Bhagwānlal and Buhler. This brings down the lower limit of his reign to c. 1147 A. D. But Jayaswal's statement betrays self-contradiction for, while he accepts 1097 A. D. as the starting date of Nānya's accession he seems inclined to hold c. 1133 as the year of his death—a date supported by Maithila traditions[3]. Thus there falls a gap of 14 years for which he offers no solution whatsoever. But, as we have already shown, the date in question comes about to c. 1147 A.D. or 1154 A. D. keeping in view the statements of Nepalese records; Nānya's wide activities in the then politics of Northern India and a tradition, though somewhat doubtful, preserved in Vidyāpati's *Puruṣa-parīkṣā*[4] pointing to

1. For details, see Ibid. 98-102.
2. P. Jha, Op. Cit. 102.
3. JBORS. X. 46.
4. I. 3.

the contemporaneity of a son of Nānya with Jayacandra (1170 A. D.)[1]. We cannot but be inclined to accept the longer period of 50 years (c. 1097-1147 A.D.). Gaṅgadeva's date of accession, therefore, must fall in 1147 A. D.

Gaṅgadeva[2] seems to have been a contemporary of Ballālasena, son of Vijayasena, who ascended the throne of Gauḍa in c. 1159 A. D. and ruled for about a period of 19 years (c. 1178 A. D.). Gaṅgadeva had a troublous beginning. The defeat of Nānya, his father, by Vajayasena left behind a gruelling memory, which soon developed into grim hostility between their successors, *i. e.*, Gaṅgadeva on the one hand and Ballālasena on the other. Local traditions unanimously refer to it[3]. This is further confirmed by a piece of evidence recorded in Ballāla-carita which speaks of the latter's kingdom comprising the five provinces of Vaṅga, Vāgaḍī, Varendra, Rāḍha and Mithilā, and of his three capitals, where he stayed occasionally. The tradition of "*Kulīnism*", said to have been implanted in Bengal by Ballālasena, was, according to some scholars, borrowed from Mithilā—a direct product of Maithila Kulīnism founded by Harisiṃhadeva in 1310 or 1313 A. D. But, the view that the tradition of " Kulīnism"

1. IHQ. VII. 680 ff. H. C. Ray also thinks that Nānya may have continued up to about the middle of the 12th century A. D. (DHNI. 1, 204-05, fn. 1).
2. R. K. Choudhary is inclined to identify this Gaṅgadeva with the Gāṅgeya of the Rāmāyaṇa MS.—a theory championed by R. C. Majumdar, referred to in the preceding chapter. (Vide--Annals, XXXV, 103-06). We have, however, shown the improbability of the above view.
3. P. Jha, Op. Cit. 110.

and "Kula-Pañjikās" in Bengal was introduced by Ballālasena has been challenged on the ground of some recent historical researches showing distinctly that little or no reliance can be placed on this theory[1]. Moreover, the dates assigned to Ballālasena (1159–1178 A. D.) and Harisiṃhadeva (1324 A. D.) conflict with eath other and preclude any such possibility of borrowing.

According to H. C. Roy, it is not impossible that Ballāla's power extended in the west upto Mithilā on the ground that its ruler Nānyadeva was defeated by Vijayasena and "there is no reason to suppose that the Sena kingdom lost any of its provinces during the next reign", which is also supported by a tradition recorded in the *Laghu-bhārata* containing references to Ballālasena's expeditions to Mithilā[2]. The advent of Lakṣmaṇasena-era in Mithilā has also been associated with this event. It is said, while Ballālasena was engaged in the campaign against that country (*i.e.*, Mithilā), he heard the news of the birth of a son, *i.e.*, Lakṣamaṇasena and an era was instituted after his name, probably in 1119—20 A.D.[3]. The fact that Nānya (1097–1147 A. D.) was defeated by one of the contemporary Sena kings—Vijayasena, indeed tempts us to believe the tradition as true. But "if this view is to be accepted, it will be seen that the Lakṣmaṇasena-era was introduced in Mithilā, during the reign of Vijayasena (and not Ballālasena,

1. For different views cf. Mishra, HML. I. p, 28, fn. 78 ; HB. I. 624-25.
2. DHNI. I. 364.
3. JASB. 1896, pt. i, p. 26.

whose date conflicts with that of the starting of the La-Saṃ.) to commemorate the birth of his grandson, which seems to have synchronised with the success of his army in that country. The diffusion of this era might have been the result of some sort of compromise brought about between the two Karṇāṭaka chiefs"[1]. H. C. Ray's view that Ballālasena led an expedition against Mithilā, which was then being ruled over by Gaṅgadeva, and that Mithilā formed a part of the Sena-kingdom, can in no case be supported, partly because of the absence of any kind of references direct or indirect to any campaign against that country in the inscriptions of Ballālasena, and partly because of the hyperbolic character of the descriptions recorded in the *Ballāla-carita* and the *Adbhuta-sāgara*, some passages of which contain the date showing that Ballālasena was living in Śaka 1090, *i.e.*, 1168 A.D. Mm. Muralīdhara Jha collected seven MSS.. from different places and edited and compi'ed the book which contains "*atha Mithilā--mahī-mahendra--niśśaṅkara śrīmadvallāla senadeva---śampādito' yaṃ Adbhutasāgaraḥ*" at the beginning and "*iti śrīmahā-rājādhirāja--niśśaṅkara śaṅkara śrīmadvallālasenadeva--viracito'dbhutasāgare*" at the end of every chapter[2]. In view of these literary evidences one can easily be led to believe that Ballālasena, the author of the *Adbhutasāgara*, actually ruled over Mithilā[3]. But careful scrutiny of these

1. HAIB. 463-64.
2. Annals. XII, 212-17.
3. Dr. R. C. Majumdar is inclined to believe that Ballālasena and his successors ruled over Mithilā for some time on the authority of Ballāla-carita (ch. I, verse 8) which states that his dominions comprised five provinces viz., Vaṅga, Varendra, Rāḍha, Bāgḍī and Mithilā. (HB. I. 212, 216-17, 170).

statements makes us venture to assert that the expedition referred to in the tradition interpreted by scholars, and that described in the *Laghukathā* may have been the same as was undertaken by his father whom he also accompanied. It was probably this halo of the erstwhile military campaigns that found its way into the *Ballāla-carita*, directly alluding the credit for victory to the author himself. Had it been otherwise or had Mithilā formed a part of the Sena kingdom under Ballālasena, the Sena inscriptions must have recorded it in no uncertain terms, which we miss so prominently in almost all the epigraphic records of the kings of this dynasty[1]. Moreover, the hostility between the Gāhaḍavālas and the Senas, and Gāhaḍavāla Govindacandra's advance upto Monghyr created a delicate situation for

Also cf. JBORS. xxv. pts. iii-iv. pp. 136-37 ; Annals, xxxv, 95-96 ; JDL. XVI, 72 ; DHNI. I, 281 ; IHQ. xxx, 205 ff : Vasu, Vaṅger Jātīya Itihāsa (Rājan-kāṇḍa) B. S. 1321, pp. 324-25.

1. Epigraphy so far has not supplied any evidence regarding Sena-rule in Bihar. Minhājuddīn's Tabaqāt-i-Nāsirī while describes Bakhtyār Khilji's conquest of the western half of the dominions of Lakṣmaṇasena, also does not suggest Sena-rule over any part of Bihar.

Dr. D. C. Sircar recently found a small bronze or aṣṭadhātu image with a metal cover over it in a locality, Sanokhār Bāzār, about 11 miles from Colgong about 20 miles from Bhagalpur. The image was kept in a rather dark corner of the Sun temple of the usual North-Indian type, known as Vaṭeśvaranātha. The inscription on it was written in the Gauḍīya characters of about the 12th century A. D., and was engraved during the ninth regnal year of Ballālasena roughly corresponding to 1166 A. D. Thus, this epigraph offers the

Ballālasena to safeguard against the apprehending danger, and retain his hold on the neighbouring territories under his direct control, instead of frittering away his power and energies to keep loose hold on a somewhat distant country like Mithilā. It is also probable that the myth woven round the term "Pañca-Gauḍa", of which Mithilā was once a part, continued to be nourished till then, and often influenced the writings of authors who, out of blind devotion and gratitude, eulogised their masters more than they actually deserved it.

Despite Nepal Vaṃśāvali's attribution of 41 (or 40) years of reign-period to Gaṅgadeva, we know very little of his reign. Even the inscription of Nānya, recovered from the village of Andhrā-Thārhī, on one of the walls of ruined temple containing a statue of Kamalāditya, founded by Śrīdhara, has nothing to record about Gaṅgadeva. Alongside with this we have another verse in *śārdūla vikṛḍita chanda*, which is totally obliterated and defies any reading or decipherment, save the name of Gaṅgadeva, which is, however, distinct and intelligible.

Thus, Śrīdhara who also served under Gaṅgadeva as his Prime Minister throws no light on his achievements. It, however, seems that after the troublous beginning Gaṅgadeva's reign was peaceful and immune from external aggressions. The Senas had already been checked by the Gāhaḍavālas, and the Gāhaḍavālas, in turn had to face the

first definite evidence regarding the expansion of Sena-rule in East Bihar about the middle of the 12th cent. A. D. This also, however, does not prove the Sena-rule over Mithilā which did not include Bhagalpur at the time. (IHQ. XXX. 210-13).

continuous Muslim inroads who were gradually pushing forward. We, therefore, find Vijayacandra, and afterwards his successors, fully engaged in repulsing the attacks of Muslim invaders like Mahamūd Gazanavi and those of his like.[1] The Senas also could not escape the impact of these attacks which later spelt their tragic doom. Thus, while all the powerful states were absorbed in preparing and mobilising their forces to cope with the new situation arising out of the most formidable enemy-attacks, Mithilā seems to have enjoyed peace and escaped the tragedy of the situation for a comparatively longer period.

The political condition of the period. though charged with heat and war-fever, proved favourable to Gaṅgadeva who got ample opportunity for carrying through certain administrative reforms, beneficial to the people of the land. He is credited with having introduced the system of fiscal division or paraganas for the purpose of revenue-administration. A *Choudhurī* or Head-man was appointed in each paragana to collect the revenue, and a ***Pañcāyata*** was chosen to settle all disputes[2]. The system was, to a great extent, maintained even by the Muslim conquerors, and prevalent till very recently. The formation of *grāma-pañcāyata* (Village-Board) and the settlement of the local disputes by this body contributed a long way towards removing many of the ills and evils accruing from petty disputes, straining the village economy unnecessarily. It is exactly on the same model that the States in free India are planning to build up the village-pañcāyatas, most of

1. IHQ. VII. 683 ff . HK. 301, 308, 319.
2. MDG. 18.

which have already come into existence. Gaṅga is further credited with having dug big tanks. Three of them, all after his name, are still extant in their original, though in diminished form[1]. Tradition also alludes the erection of a big fort now lying deep beneath the surface of the earth in the same Andhrā-Thārhi village, to Gaṅga. A few pieces of stones bearing his name have also been recovered from the ruins.

It appears that he maintained a separate department for religious affairs, of which Dharmādhikaraṇika the celebrated Vardhamāna Upādhyāya was the minister. According to some scholars he flourished during the time of Rāmasiṃhadeva, the grand-son of Gaṅgadeva. His exact date is not known. But from the literary accounts it appears that he served both Gaṅgadeva and his grand-son Rāmasiṃhadeva.[2]

As regards Gaṅgadeva's suzerainty over Nepal, it was just a loose sort of hegemony. It is probable that he exacted tributes and often influenced the political activities thereof.

1. P. Jha, Op. Cit. 112-13 ; Annals, XXXV, 106-07.
2. P. Jhā, Op. Cit. p. 112. He thinks that Dharmādhikaraṇika Vardhamāna Upādhyāya, author of Daṇḍa-viveka flourished in the time of Gaṅgadeva. One of his tanks called Mathiāhi is still found in village Ashi in Darbhanga district and there was a temple of Viṣṇu and Garuḍa on the bank of that tank. There is also an inscription which reads :

"जातो वंशे बिल्वपंचाभिधाने, धर्माध्यक्षो वर्धमानो भवेशात्
देवास्याग्रे देवयष्टिध्वजाग्रा, स्पष्टं कृत्वाऽस्थापयद्वैनतेयम्"

This inscription is now kept in Hāṭī Nīlakoṭhī.

Narasiṃhadeva

Gaṅgadeva was succeeded by his son Narasiṃhadeva or Nṛsiṃhadeva in c. 1187 A. D. (or 1181 A. D ?)[1]. The Nepal Vaṃśāvali simply gives his name and a reign-period of 31 years. The Nepalese inscriptions too, do not go further. A passage composed by the king himself and preserved in Rāmadatta's *Dāna-Paddhati* states that Śrīmān Nṛsiṃhadeva, "the crest-jewel of the Karṇāṭas" (*Karṇāṭanvayabhūṣaṇaḥ*), was the 'unquestioned sovereign" of Mithilā and that Rāmadatta was his minister[2]. A commentary on Sūrya-Siddhānta, an astronomical treatise by Caṇḍeśvarācārya (different from the author of Ratnākara) during his reign or a bit earlier (Śaka 1100, *i.e.*, 1178 A. D. ?), and now preserved in the Nepal Rāj Library has also nothing to say about him.

1. For different dates cf. VR. Intro. xviii ; Dās (p. 62) places him between 1149-1201 A. D. and P. Jha (Op. Cit. 115) places him between 1139 1191 A. D. ; Annals, xxxv 107 ; IA. 1880, p. 188
2. Monmohan Chakravarti observes that Rāmadatta was uncle's son of Caṇḍeśvara Thakkura and was, therefore, near in time to that author. Hence Rāmadatta's master king Narasiṃhadeva must have been near in time to Caṇḍeśvara's master king Harisiṃhadeva. The former very likely succeeded the latter (JASB. N. S. 1915, p. 413). The suggestion is absurd for Narasiṃhadeva was certainly the grand-father of Harisiṃhadeva, and flourished some 90 years before the Karṇāṭa line of Mithilā ended with Harisiṃhadeva. Neither tradition nor epigraphic nor iiterary records speak of any such king as Narasiṃhadeva by name as Harisiṃha's immediate successor.

According to a story (*satyavīrakathā-prasaṅga*) narrated by Vidyāpati in his *Puruṣa-parīkṣā*, this Narasiṃha served as a commander in the army of Shāhābuddin Ghori, the first Muslim ruler of Delhi, and got the Maithila kingdom as a reward for his meritorious service. According to another version Narasiṃha, due to his uncompromising attitude towards the Sultan, was imprisoned and compelled to fight against the Sultan's enemies, and was later rewarded with the kingdom of Mithilā for his outstanding part in defeating the enemies[1]. But for slight differences in description and narration, the theme remains the same. If this story is to be believed, we must assume that Mithilā had by the time passed under the subjugation of the Muslim rulers—a fact which is neither supported by indigenous evidences nor corroborated by the statement of the contemporary or later Muslim historians. We know of no such Muslim invasion of Tirhut before Muhammad Bakhtyār Khilji who in A. D. 1200 is said to have led a military expedition against Bihar and ravaged that territory[2]. Moreover, the king Narasiṃhadeva could in no case have been the Narasiṃhadeva, mentioned in the story, as the former reigned from c. 1187-1225 A.D. It was not Mohammad Ghori, but Ghiyāsuddin, the father and predecessor of Muhammad-bin-Tughlak, who, while returning from the conquest of Bengal (A.D. 1323) passed through Tirhut when Harisiṃhadeva was its ruler, and took our present Narasiṃhadeva (of Vidyāpati's story) to Delhi,

1. P. Jha, Op. Cit. 115 ; Ilyas Rahmani's article in Mithilā, dated 2nd Feb. 1953, p. 6 ; Annals, xxxv, pp. 107 ff.
2. TN. 550 ; Brigg's Ferishta, Vol. I. 231 ; Annals, xxxv. 107-08.

whose exact identity we do not know. He might have been a scion of this line (Narasiṃhadeva II ?) but could in no case have been the ruler of Mithilā. We have, therefore, no ground to believe that the Maithila kingdom faced Muslim surveillance at the very first stroke of the Muslim sword[1] which "was dulled for a considerable time when it crossed the sharp steel of the gallant Gāhaḍavāla Vijayacandra who, like his father Govindacandra, stood as a bulwark against the Muslims" and "swept away the affliction of the globe by streams (of water flowing as) from clouds from the eyes of the wives of Hammīra, the abode of wanton destruction to the earth"[2]. Jayacandra, his son, is also credited with having overcome the king of Ghor before his final engagement with him—a claim also supported by Vidyāpati in his "*Puruṣa-parīkṣā*"[3].

The Cauhān chronicles describe Jayacandra as having " overcome the king of the North, making eight tributary kings prisoner". That he was then "the greatest king"[4] is perhaps true, keeping in view the petty independent states dotted all over Northern India. But that he also subjugated all the kings of north, including Mithilā, is extremely doubtful.

1. Far detailed discussion see Chap. VIII (The Age of Muslim Conquest).
2. IA. XV, 7 (verse 9).
3. 11th Tale (Ed. Grierson).
   For different views, cf. P. Jha, Op. Cit., 115 ; Rahmani, Op. Cit. p. 6 ; Annals, xxxv, 107 ff.
4. Tod, Vol. II. 936, 365 ; Elliot, II. 251.

It is also said that in the time of Narasiṃhadeva Mithilā and Nepal were separated due to some quarrel between him and his kinsman, the king of Nepal[1]. Henceforward she came to be ruled independently till another invasion from Harisiṃhadeva, the last king of the line. We have, however, not the least support from the historical records of the period to corroborate this statement[2].

Like his father Narasiṃhadeva's reign-period witnessed little political activities of any significance. Again, like his predecessors he is credited with having dug tanks and built temples. Though tradition describes him as a brave warrior, Jayaswal takes him to be "a weak king". We have also a reference to his two ministers Rāmāditya and Karmāditya Thakkuras, holding two different portfolios, and serving as his advisers.

He died in c. 1225 A. D.[3] probably after a reign-period of 31 years.

Rāmasiṃhadeva

Rāmasiṃha succeeded his father in c. 1225 (or 1227) A. D. According to Monmohan Chakravarti he was the

1. DDG. 18 ; Singh, 62.
2. K. R. Kānungo thinks that after the death of one Arimalladeva, the ruler of eastern Tirhut came within the sphere of influence of Lakhnāvati (HB. II. 22-23). The statement is confused and vague and we have examined it fully in Chap. VIII.
3. According to Jayaswal 1174-1208 A. D. (JBORS. X. 46) ; and according to Chowdhary 1188-1227 A. D. (Annals, xxxv. 107).

last king of this dynasty.[1] Bendall has confounded him with Rāmabhadradeva, son of Bhairavendra of the Oinavāra dynasty.[2] Apart from his mention in the traditional account of the Nepalese inscriptions, his time is fixed by a (palm leaf) Ms. oft he Kṛtya-Kalpataru (Śuddhi) by Lakṣmīdhara. Its copying was completed in the reign of Rāmasiṃhadeva on Saturday, the 14th of the bright half of the month Pauṣa in Saṃ 1446. or 1st January 1390 which was a Saturday.[3] This is the only evidence (i. e., date 1390 A. D.) that forms the basis of Chakravarti's conclusion. But this is not a surer ground, for we have two other Mss. of Vyavahāra-Kalpataru (1172 A. D.)[4] and Kṛtya-Kalpataru[5] both by the same author, Lakṣmīdhara, who is said to have been the son of Hṛdayadhara Bhaṭṭa, Minister for War and Foreign Affairs of Mahārājādhirāja Govindacandradeva of Kanuaj. The digest, Vyavahāra-Kalptaru was completed by the order of the king, and dates from 12th century A. D. The Ms. of Kṛtya-Kalpataru (palmleaf–last leaf in the Library of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal) bears L. S. 374, i. e., 1493 A. D., and was prepared by the order of Śrīmad Gadādharasiṃhadeva. The different dates raise a significant point. Some scholars have accepted this Rāmasiṃhadeva as the Karṇāṭa king flourishing in 1390

1. JASB. 1915 (N. S.), p. 413.
2. JASB. 1903. pt. ii, p. 19.
3. Ind. Govt. MS. 4741; Cat. Skt. Mss. in the Library of RASB. No. 1951; RASB. palm-leaf, No. 100.
4. Mitra, Notices II, No. 1833.
5. Duff, 288; Eggeling, 409.

A. D.[1] M. M. Chakravarti has placed him two steps below Harisiṃhadeva. According to the Nepalese sources and Mithilā tradition Rāmasiṃha undoubtedly preceded Harisiṃhadeva. He was fourth in descent from Nānyadeva. Various commentaries and learned treatises were written under his patronage.

Karmāditya Thakkura was probably his Minister for Peace and War. This is evident from Caṇḍeśvara's Kṛtya Cintāmaṇi[2] and the Maithila *Pañjī-prabandha.*[3] His inscription dated L. S. 212 is still unnoticed.[4]

All historical evidences thus prove that Harisiṃhadeva was the last great king of the Karṇāṭa line. Rāmasiṃha of the Śuddhi-Kalpataru colophon was probably a local ruling chieftain. He cannot be identified with any Karṇāṭa king as Mithilā-tradition and available historical evidence do not give us any clue.[5]

The advent of his reign was preceded by significant events in Northern India. From the Tārācaṇḍī Rock Inscription[6], the Bodhagayā Inscription of Jayacandra and

1. IHQ XXVI. No. 4, p. 287 fn; JASB. (N. S.), XI, p. 414 & 432
2. " .वादित्य इति त्रिलोकमहितो मन्त्रीन्द्रचूड़ामणि: "
3 "गढ़ बिसपी संबीजी त्रिपाठी कर्मादित्य: ऐ सुतौ सान्धिविग्रहिक देवादित्य--राजवल्लभ भवादित्य" (Pañjī-prabandha, Raj Library Ms. Darbhanga.)
4. The inscription is known as Hābīḍīha inscription. It reads: "अब्दे नेत्रशशांकपक्ष २१२ गणिते श्रीलक्ष्मणक्ष्मापतेर्मासि श्रावणसंज्ञके मुनितिथौ स्वात्यां गुरौ शोभने हावी प(त्त)ट्टनसंज्ञके सुविदिते हैहट्टदेवी शिवा कर्मादित्यसुमन्त्रिणेह विहिता सौभाग्यदेव्याज्ञया ।" Tilakeśvara temple also bears the name of Karmāditya.
5 cf. Annals. XXXV. 111-12.
6. EI. VII. 98.

other inscriptions it is clear that the Gāhaḍavālas had gradually advanced into Magadha, during 1124—1180 A. D. The moribund Pāla power was already crushed out of existence, having been attacked on both its flanks. The struggle of the Senas and Gāhaḍavālas receded to the dim background the moment the Turks appeared on the scene with a thundering bang. The entire political stage was terribly shaken up. The Hindus had fought and lost the second battle of Tarāorī (1192 A. D.). The gates of Delhi had been forcibly broken open and bands of adventurous Muslim cavaliers got scattered over the Gaṅgā--Jamunā valley. Malik Husāu-ud-Din was one such chief who had carved out a principality in Oudh under Muhammad-ibn-Bakhtyar, a Turk belonging to the Khalji tribe of Ghur, "a daring and reckless cavalry-leader" who carried on regular invasions into the territory of "Muner and Bihar", and captured "a fortified city of Bihar"[1] in course of which "the whole of the Hindus had been killed".[2] The defeat of the Cāhamānas at Tarāorī signalled the final retreat of the Gāhaḍavālas from the scene of Bihar. The Senas, who occasionally raided the land, lay further east. Magadha was as if "a no man's land". With the capture of the so-called "Fort of Bihar"—which was nothing but "the fortified university town"—the seize of Bihar was successfully effected (c. 1193 A. D.).

It was now the turn of Bengal under Lakṣmaṇasena. Muhammad launched upon his further expedition. "The fall of the powerful dynasties of Cāhamānas and the

1. TN. 530.
2. Ibid. 552.

Gāhaḍavālas convinced the courtiers that nothing could possibly stop the oncoming tide".[1] The fall of Nādiā compelled the Sena king—Lakṣmaṇasena to flee away and cross over to 'Baṅg' or Eastern Bengal. With his flight, an important chapter, full of the tales of sanguinary battles and blood-sheds coupled with those of slavery and depredations, unfolded itself in the history of Northern India.

It seems, however, that Mithilā, for the most part escaped the deluge of Musalman inroads during this century. The Mohammedans, no doubt, on their way to Lakhanāwatī marched from Oudh via Bihar. They, however, did not try to pass north of the Gaṅgā. We learn from the Tabākat-i-Nāsiri that Sultan Husāmud-Din-Iwaz (1213-1227 A. D.), the fourth Malik of Lakhanāwatī exacted tribute from the neighbouring countries of Baṅg, Kāmrūd (i. e., Kāmarūpa) and Tirhut.[2] The claim seems to have been rather vague and put in by way of praise.[3] The only recorded inroad into the country of Tirhut was made by the ninth Malik Izz-ud-Din Tughril (1233—1244 A. D.) who came from Lakhanāwatī and "acquired much valuable ooty". The event took place during the reign of Rāmasiṁhadeva. But it appears that the Muslim invaders, having been satisfied with the 'valuable booty", went back to their original place, because these Musalman governors of the frontier tracts like Lakhanāwatī, Bihar and Oudh " were changed so often and were so busy with their own internal dissensions

3. DHNI. I, 374.
1. TN. 587-88.
2. JASB. (N. S.) 1915, pp. 407--08; 1908, p. 157.

or in fighting their rebellious subjects that they had hardly any time or opportunity to attack Tirhut". The natural boundaries of the land also helped in keeping the enemies at bay. Tirhut was then, as is now though to a lesser degree, protected on the north by the impenetrable forests of the Himālayan Terāi. On the other three sides the rivers Gaṇḍakī, Gaṅgā and the Kauśikī (Kośī) in the west, on the south and on the east respectively formed deep and broad moats not easy to cross. Moreover, the land itself being intersected by a net-work of smaller streams, presenting formidable obstacles to the rapid movement of cavalry, the chief arm of the Muslim invaders, rendered the inroads for booty infeasible, while for inroads of conquests neither Oudh nor Lakhanāwatī was near enough to form a strong base.[1] Also the stubborn resistance put up by Rāmasiṃhadeva—which is clear from his epithets like "*Bhujavala Bhīme*" and "*Bhīma parākrame*" etc.—must have contributed, to some degree to dull the sharp edge of the striking Muslim swords. But, whatever the cause, "luckily for Sanskrit learning Mithilā escaped during a century and a quarter the Turkish ravages that devastated the adjoining provinces", providing refuge to a number of Sanskrit scholars flying from the flames of foreign invasion that burnt up the neighbouring centres of learning. And, therefore we find the court of Rāmasiṃhadeva thronged with scholars from all parts of Northern India, well versed in various branches of Sanskrit learning and studies.[2]

1. JASB. (N. S.) 1915, pp. 407--08.
2. For details, see Chap. VIII.

Rāmasiṃhadeva's reign-period was thus marked with less political activities and more intellectual fervour. This resulted in immortal literary creations and philosophical attainments. Himself a pious devotee and an author of remarkable genius he contributed to various branches of sacred literature. He is perhaps one of the few scholar-kings who is so often quoted by later authorities on sacred literature.

His reign-period also witnessed a series of vital reforms—administrative, social and religious. Rules were framed for the guidance of Hindus in their religious and social observances. An officer was appointed in each village to adjudicate upon all questions arising from the working of the new canons of conduct.[1] Various reforms in the system of internal administration are attributed to him. In every village was appointed a police officer whose duty it was to make a daily report of all occurrences, worthy of note to the *Choudurī*, the Head Revenue-Collector of the paraganā. The latter was given in return for his services a certain quantity of land Its produce was appropriated by him and his heirs-in-office. To the same period is also attributed the system of the ***Paṭawāris*** or Village-Accountants who were, it is said, paid at the rate of Rs. 10/- only a month from the village-funds.[2] This system was continuously maintained by the later rulers as well as the petty land-lords, whose fast dying vestiges can yet be seen in Mithilā. He is credited with having built up several temples and tanks.

1. MDG. 18.
2. Ibid. 18.

After a reign of 58 years—perhaps the longest one in the history of the land—Rāmasiṃha breathed his last in c. 1276 A. D.[1]

Śaktisiṃhadeva[2]

From an inscription of Pratāpamalla of Kāṭhamāṇḍū (dated Nepal Saṃvat 769), the Nepal Vaṃśāvali[3] and a significant verse narrating the family-tree of the Karṇāṭa kings[4] we know that Śaktisiṃha, on the death of his father Rāmasiṃhadeva, ascended the throne of Mithilā. He was in his forties when he took up the reigns, as the considerably long period of his father's reign would suggest. Tradition avers that he was a Śakra (Indra) incarnate, by virtue of his valour and war-like talents. He was a contemporary of Allā-ud-Din Khilji, then on the throne of Delhi. According to Maithila scholars this Śakra (Śakti) siṃhadeva of Mithilā was friendly with the Delhi Sultān, and even helped him in his fight against Hammīra (Hambīra) of Raṇathambhaura ("*Hambīradhvānta bhānuḥ*") in which Devāditya Thakkura (his minister) along with his

1. According to some writer, he died in 1285 A. D. (Vide—Annals, XXXV. 110.
2. Mithilā tradition calls him Sakrasiṃhadeva. In the Nepalese inscription and Vaṃśāvali we have the name Saktisiṃha.
3. IA. IX. 188.
4. P. Jhā, Op. Cit. 119.

son Vīreśvara also accompanied him[1]. It is difficult to find the truth in this statement. Allā-ud-Din's Raṇathambhaura-expedition, however, remains a cold fact, and constitutes a land-mark of Muslim conquest, in the history of medieval India. From Ferishta's account it is clear that Allā-ud-Din conquered the whole of Bihar, for we have a reference to his scheme of forming a barrier to protect India from the invasions of Moghuls[2]. This was not possible lest the whole of Bihar came under him–particularly the Northern portions comprising the Tirhut territory. It is possible that the Sultan realised the natural difficulties and the strategic position of Tirhut and thought it wiser to subdue the foe by love and friendly gesture rather than the force of the sword, which the traditional friendliness and loyalty of Śaktisiṃha towards the Sultan may justify[3].

1. Caṇḍeśvara, Devāditya's grand-son and Minister for Peace and War to Harisiṃhadeva, describes the event in his Kṛtya-Cintāmaṇi and addresses him as "हम्मीरध्वान्तभानुः". Vidyāpati in his Puruṣa-parīkṣā ("Dayā-vīra-kathā-prasaṅga") says: "सर्वं त्यक्त्वा समितिपतितो हम्बीरदेवः". It is also said that Sultan Allā-ud-Din conferred the title of "Mantrī-Ratnākara" on Devāditya Thakkura for his valuable services in the fight. These literary evidences hardly find support in the statements by the contemporary historians
2. Briggs. Vol. I. p. 366 ; Ain-i-Akbari, Vol. II. p. 304.
3. Some scholars believe that during the time of Sakti (Sakra) siṃha there was another Muslim attack on Mithilā in Hijri 697. The Muslim army under Sheikh Mohammad Ismail defeated the Karṇāṭas, forced them to pay tax and arrested the Maithila king. He was later released and appointed Commander-in Chief of Hindu army. It was after this event that Sakrasiṃha helped Allā-ud-Din Khilji in his fight against

The above statement, however, raises another point of chronological importance. Allā-ud-Din's Raṇathambaura-expedition took place in 1301 A.D. From the available evidences it seems that Śaktisiṃha died in or before 1296 A. D. Thus the two dates stand apart. Local traditions support Allā-ud-Din-Śaktisiṃha episode. The two events can be reconciled only when we suppose that Śaktisiṃha died in c. 1303 A. D., the date of his son, Harisiṃha's accession to the throne.

Tradition goes that, unlike his father, Śaktisiṃhadeva was a cruel despot. He never cared for the welfare of his people. His absolute despotism evoked bitter reactions from the nobles and courtiers. One of his ministers, probably Caṇḍeśvara Mehatā (Thakkura), established a Council of Seven Elders to serve as a check on the autocratic power of the king[1]. An outstanding scholar, Caṇḍeśvara was a veteran politician of the age. He played a very prominent part in effecting the bloodless palace-revolution which curbed the king's power and put effective checks on his authority. This was the first event of its kind in the history of the land.

Hamīr of Raṇathambhaura (Rahmani, Op Cit. 9th Feb. '53, p. 6). This account is evidently based on the dairy of Mullā Taqiā, and is nowhere mentioned in Mithilā tradition or in the writings of the contemporary Muslim historians. A Makabarā in Darbhanga reminds one of the struggle between the Muslims and Sakrasiṃha. Sakari commemorates the name of Sakrasiṃha. Sukhīdighī is said to have been dug during his time. (cf. Annals, xxxv. 113, fn. 3).

1. MDG. 18.

The last days of Śaktisiṃhadeva were not happy. He had to face the long pent-up Muslim hostility, aroused now to its barbarous fury[1]. Although he successfully avoided it, the smouldering fire blazed forth in the following period, burning root and soil the Karṇāṭa dynasty of which his son, Harisiṃha was the last remnant.

Harisiṃhadeva[2]

Śaktisiṃhadeva's son and successor, Harisiṃhadeva was the last great king of the line. He was greater in many respects than Nānyadeva, the founder of the line. His several religious and social reforms revolutionised the Maithila society. A stormy political career, he will go down in the history of the land as the greatest social reformer who organised the Maithila society in a new set-up which is yet extant despite its adverse effects.

1. cf. M. Jhā, Op. Cit. 412.
2. The name of Harisiṃhadeva is at times mis-spelt as Harasiṃhadeva. Vidyāpati in his Puruṣa-parīkṣā gives the form 'Hari' (II. Subuddhikathā—" आसीन्मिथिलायां कर्णाट-कुलसम्भवो हरिसिंहदेवो नाम राजा...."). The same form appears in a Nepal inscription (IA. 1880, p. 89, No. 19, verse 10—" जात: श्रीहरिसिहदेव नृपति: प्रौढ़ प्रतापोदय: . . ."), and also in the living chronicles of Mithilā. The only book of Caṇḍeśvara which gives the name of the king as 'Hara' is Kṛtya-Ratnākara (I. O. Cat. No. 1387--"अस्ति श्रीहरसिंहदेव....कर्णाटवंशोद्भव:") The from 'Hari' is also found in the ASB. Ms. No. 8224 in Devanāgarī characters. Jyotirīśvara's 'Dhūrttasamāgama' gives the form 'Hara'(wrongly read by some scholars as 'Narasiṃhadeva"—cf. VR.xv ff; Cat. Nepal Durbār Lib. p. 66. No. 1536). But the traditional śloka current in Mithilā about Harisiṃha's flight and retreat into Nepal gives

The inscription of Pratāpamalladeva of Kāṭhamāṇḍū records that after Śaktisiṃha and before Harisiṃha there was one king Bhūpālasiṃha, on the throne of Mithilā[1]. But neither the literary traditions nor any other evidences corroborate this statement. It may be argued, however, that this Bhūpāla was the elder brother of Harisiṃhadeva. He probably never ascended the throne either due to his sudden death, or any other reasons beyond our knowledge. All that we know of him is merely his name, and nothing more.

According to Candra Jhā Harisiṃha was born in 1294 A. D. Some local scholars believe that he was anointed, when he was only 12 (c. 1307 A.D.)[2]. The variations in dates are slight and we can safely presume that Harisiṃha ascended the throne when he was just a minor of about 10-12 (*i e*, c. 1307 or 1303 A. D.). He was a contemporary of the Yādava king Rāmadeva of Devagiri (1309 A. D.). The two kings were on terms of correspondence[3]. The gap of seven to eight years intervening the death of Śaktisiṃha

the form 'Hari' ("त्यक्त्वा स्वपट्टनपुरीं हरिसिंहदेवो"--VR. xvii; JASB. 1903. pt. i; Singh 65; Das, 64). The Pañjī also gives the form Hari ("शाके श्रीहरिसिंहदेवनृपतिर्भूपार्कतुल्योजनिः. . "). Muslim historians also call him Harisiṃha (cf. Rahmani, op. cit. 6; Annals, xxxv. 114, fn 3). The above references show that his real name was Harisiṃha, which is mis-spelt at times as Harasiṃha (RR. 13, fn. 2).

1. IA. IX. 188: "श्रीशक्तिसिंहो धरणिपति-रतो-भूपालसिंहः"; also cf. the Pañjī Verse (Candra Jha, 68).
2. According to Candra Jha, 1303 A.D.; also cf. M. Jhā, Op. Cit. 414; Puruṣa-parīkṣā (ed. Grierson). p. 47, fn. 1.
3. RR. Intro. 16.

and the accession of Harisiṃha can be explained in terms of the after-effects of the palace-revolution against Śakti-siṃha's autocratic rule. It may also be suggested that the Council of Elders governed in the name of Harisiṃhadeva, till his attainment of maturity. He was fortunate in having some of the wittiest and most shrewd ministers like Devāditya Thakkura, his Minister for Peace and War Affairs (*sāndhi-vigraha-mantrīndra*), his son Vīreśvara Thakkura (given the epithet "*Sa prakṛtya Mahāvārtika Naibandhika*" for his unrivalled learning) and the latter's son Mahāmattaka Caṇḍeśvara Thakkura, Minister for War and Peace[1].

Harisiṃhadeva was quite young when Caṇḍeśvara became his minister. The contemporary records say that his reign-period bristled with various activities. Of all, his social reforms and sub-caste-divisions, enumerated in the Maithila *Pañjī-prabandha*, are most significant. Hardly a few years after his accession to the throne, he introduced a new system of "*Kulīnism*", which divided the Maithila Brāhmaṇas and Kāyasthas into several sections in order of merit.

A zealous reformer and a vigorous warrior, Harisiṃhadeva was also a great patron of learning. Devāditya, Vīreśvara, Caṇḍeśvara etc. were some of the shining luminaries of the time. They belonged to the famous Thakkura-family which virtually monopolised learning and intellect and power. Caṇḍeśvara's Kṛtya-Ratnākara consists of several sections. The first section is a general digest of

1. KR. (ASB. MS. fol. Ia); I. O. MS. No. 1387; I. O. Cat. III. Nos. 1387-90.

Hindu law and the other one deals with civil law[1]. A *śloka* at **the** end of the section on civil law says that Caṇḍeśvara was living in Śaka 1236, *i. e.,* A. D. 1314[2]. In that year he gave away his weight in gold on the river Vāgmatī. This shows that Tulādāna was in vogue in Mithilā at the time, though limited to the rich only. The seven different sections[3] show that every aspect of religious and social life was fully discussed and advice and guidance were given to the king in the matter of religion, administration, etc. The king always responded to these injunctions, the practices and usages, as the author was himself an important minister. The Vivāda-Ratnākara (treatise on law) has been the ruling authority in the Maithila School of Hindu Law, for the past six centuries[4]. Tradition also credits Harisiṃha with the construction of several temples and tanks spreading all over the land, for the welfare and relief of his subjects.

It appears that evil days befell Harisiṃhadeva towards the end of his reign (1324 A. D.). The fury of the Muslim conquerors, aroused during the reign of Śaktisiṃhadeva, had now its violent way. The smouldering fire suddenly burst aflame on the firmament of Mithilā. The Muslim conquerers had by now laid deep their feet into the soil; known about her people and their resources, their manners and customs, and most important of all, their inherent weaknesses. In 1324 A. D. Sultan

1. I. O. Cat. III. No. 1387.
2. Ibid. Nos. 1387 &1390.
3. (i) Kṛtya, (ii) Dāna, (iii) Vyavahāra, (iv) Suddhi, (v) Pūjā, (vi) Vivāda and (vii) Gṛhastha.
4. RR. 12 (Intro.).

Ghiyās-ud-Din Tughlak undertook an expedition to Bengal, and on his way back passed through Tirhut. According to Ferishta, as the Sultan was passing near the hills of Tirhut, the Rājā (Harisiṃhadeva) appeared in arms, but was persued into the woods.[1] Finding that his army could not penetrate them (the woods) the king alighted from his horse, called for a hatchet and cut down one of the trees with his own hands. The troops on seeing this, cut the forest with such speed that it seemed to vanish before them. They arrived at length at a fort surrounded by seven ditches, full of water and a high wall. The ditches were filled up and the wall was destroyed in three weeks. The Rājā and his family were taken, while the government of Tirhut was left in the hands of Ahmud Khan, the son of Mullik Tublighā. After this the king turned towards Dehly (Delhi). According to Barni, "when the Sultan reached Tirhut, the ruler of Lakhānautī, Sultan Nasir-ud-Din, came forthwith being called in requisition, all the Rāis and Rāṇas of the country made their submission".[2] That this "Rājā of Tirhoot", referred to by Ferishta, was none other than Harisiṃhadeva, appears to be suggested by the traditional date N. S. 444 (A. D. 1324) of the latter's invasion of Nepal and the references in contemporary literature to his conflicts with the Musalmans.[3] In the

1. Briggs, I. pp. 406-07.
2. Tarikh-i-Firozshahi (Elliot, III, 234).
3. Le Nepal, II, 220. The date is also given as Saka 1245 which, according to H. C. Ray, is wrong by about a year. (DHNI. I, 217 fn. 2); JASB. 1915 (N. S.), pp. 411-12, fn. 4 & 5; LXV. pt. i, pp.30-31.

Dāna-Ratnākara[1] of Caṇḍeśvara, the king is described as having rescued the earth flooded by the Mlecchas, i. e., Musalmans. In Kaviśekharācārya Jyotirīśvara's Dhurta-Samāgama (a two-act comedy played in the court of the "Karṇāṭa cūḍāmaṇi" king Harisiṃhadeva) the king is said to have conquered the Suratrāṇa (Sultan). The comedy speaks of a ferocious fight. It was composed some time after the fight between Harisiṃha and the Sultan, i.e., after 1324 A. D.. Harisiṃha, therefore, was living in 1325 or 1326 A. D.[2] This shows that Harisiṃha was not captured by the Sultan as the Muslim historians have claimed.[3] On the other hand, he fled from Tirhut, invaded Nepal and settled down there for the rest of

1 "मग्नाम्लेच्छमहार्णवेयेनोद्धृता लीलये" (Verse 2). Also see Mitra, Notices. VI. 135, No. 2069.

2. JASB. 1915 (N. S.), p. 412.

3, Harisiṃhadeva is said to have defeated some Muslim king. This is corroborated by Caṇḍeśvara and Jyotirīśvara (Nepal Darbār Cat. No. 1536. p. 66 : "नानायोधनिरुद्धनिर्जितसुरत्राणात्र सद्गाहिनी। नृत्यद्भीमकबन्धमेलकदलद्भूमिभ्रमद्भूधर।। अस्ति श्रीहरसिंहदेव नृपतिः....", It is believed that he recovered his kingdom after the tide was stemmed, since it was after the expulsion of the Muslims, or after their voluntary retirement, that Dhūrta-samāgama of Jyotirīśvara and Dāna-Ratnākara of Caṇḍeśvara were composed (VR. xvii). Tha neighbouring Muslim kingdom probably raided Mithilā, and Caṇḍeśvara took active part in expelling them out of Tirhut, The expulsion. if true, was however, transitory, for in 1324 A.D. Mithilā was successfully attacked and captured by the Muslim invaders. It is possible that the Dāna-Ratnākara refers to the defeat of Bengal (Vide—RR. 18 ff; Singh, 67; P. Jha, 135; Rahmani, op. cit. 9th Feb. 1953, p. 6).

his life. It was then that the two act comedy of Jyotirīśvara was composed and staged.

The Delhi Sultan continued to claim overlordship of Tirhut. It was in support of this claim that Ghiyās-ud-Din's son Muhammad Tughlak issued coins with the mint-name, Tughlakpur, urf Tirhut. Two of these coins still exist and belong to the forced currency system (brass for silver). One in the Indian Musuem is dated 731 H. (1330-31 A. D.). These two coins were believed to be the specimens of Muhammad's fantastic attempts to force people to use brass coins in the place of silver for the same value.[1]

THE INVASION OF NEPAL

The invasion of Nepal by Harisiṃhadeva was the natural consequence of his rout at the hands of the Muslim invaders with the fall of Simrāon "the fort surrounded by seven ditches". Harisiṃha was now unable to cope with ferocious armies of the Sultan and had no alternative but to flee towards the Northern hills.[2] In course of

1. JASB. 1915 (N. S.), p. 412. These two coins weigh 140 and 133 grains respectively. Also cf. Rodger's Ind. Mus. Coins, pt. i, p. 63, No. 12911; Bourdillon's Cat. Ind. Mus. Coins, Vol. II, p. 60, No. 384; JASB. 1883, p. 52, pl. x, fig. 32 respectively.
2. The traditional śloka current in Mithilā makes the following definite statement :

"बाणाब्धि-बाहु-शशि-सम्मित-शाकवर्षे पौषस्य शुक्लदशमी-क्षितिसूनुवारे
त्यक्त्वा स्व-पट्टनपुरीं हरिसिंहदेवो दुर्दैव-देशित-पथे-गिरिमाविवेश"

(" Harisiṃhadeva compelled by cruel fate abandoned his beautiful city and went to the hills in Saka 1245"—cf. JASB. IV, 124; VR. xvii).

his flight he entered Nepal with his followers, bidding good-bye to Mithilā, the land of his ancestors, and founded the Sūryavaṃśī dynasty of Bhaṭagāon there.[1] It was, indeed, an irony of fate that Harisiṃhadeva turned towards Nepal in a much worse condition than his ancestor Nānyadeva – though both did so after having sustained reverses at the hands of outside powers. While the latter maintained his suzerainty over his original kingdom, the former had to leave his home-land under compulsion, to seek refuge in the same territory, which, of course, he conquered. This incidentally was the second invasion of Nepal, again by one belonging to the same dynasty.[2]

That Harisiṃha conquered Nepal is a clear demonstration of the fact that Nepal was by then lost to some other power, probably the Sultan of Delhi, Alla-ud-Din Khilji.[3] In the Kāṭhamāṇḍū inscription[4] Harisiṃha is

1. IA. XIII. 414.
2. According to D. R. Regmi. the conquest of the valley of Kāṭhamāṇḍū by Harisiṃhadeva took place in 1314 A.D. (according to Bhagwanlal and Wright in 1324 A.D.). He, however, could not retain his hold for long. The rise of the Mallas in the valley and the Tughlaqs outside put him in a precarious position. When Muhammad Tughlaq forced him to retire to the hills in 1324 A. D. he devoted himself solely to consolidate his position there (Ancient & Medieval Nepal, 151-52). As regards his first Invasion of Nepal we have no evidences to support it. The second invasion is, however, an established historical fact. Since this time also we have a number of Maithila Brāhmaṇas in the Nepal valley.
3. According to Jayaswal (JBORS. XXII. 86) Nepal at the time seemed to have leaned towards Delhi, for we find a coin struck in Nepal in the name of Allā-ud-Din Khilji (1296—1316 A.D.). Also cf. JASB. (N. S.), 1929, p. 37.
4. This inscription (IA 1880, p. 189, No. 19, Verse 10) confirms his sovereignty in Nepal :

called "*Karṇāṭa-cūḍāmaṇi*" (The crest jewel of Karṇāṭa), or "*Karṇāṭa-vaṃśodbhava*". These epithets disprove the claim contained in the local Vaṃśāvali that he was connected with the indigenous dynasty of the Nepal valley. It also appears that the reigning king Jayarudramalla submitted to the invader without offering any effective resistance. According to the Vaṃśāvali four kings including Harisiṃhadeva of the Sūryavaṃśī dynasty of Bhaṭagāon ruled over the valley—Harisiṃhadeva 28 years (conquered the valley, Śaka saṃ. 1245 or N. S. 444 or 1324 A. D.); his son Matisiṃhadeva 15 years; his son Śaktisiṃhadeva 22 (27 or 33) years and his son Śyāmasiṃhadeva 15 years.[1] Śaktisiṃhadeva is said to have received a letter from the Emperor of China with a seal bearing the inscription "*Saktisiṃharāma*" in the Chinese year (chīnābda) 535.[2] Sylvain Levi, after a thorough examination of the Chinese records, has thrown light on these kings whom the Chinese documents knew and recognised as sovereigns of Nepal,[3] the descendants of

"जातः श्रीहरिसिंहदेवनृपतिः प्रौढ़प्रतापोदयः
तद्वंशे विमले महारिपुहरे गाम्भीर्यरत्नाकरः
कर्नाटे यः सरसामुपेत्य मिथिलां संलक्ष्य लक्ष्मप्रियो
नेपाले पुनराश्रवै भवगुतेस्थैर्यः चिरम्विद्यते"

1 P. Jha (p 144) assigns 25 years to Saktisiṃha & 12 years to Syāmasiṃha.

2. IA XIII, 414.

3. Perceval Landon (Nepal, Vol. I, pp. 37-39) suggests that the Chinese Emperor Häng Wū sent two emissaries to the king of Nepal whose name was **ma-ta na** (Matisiṃha) The Chinese envoy brought an official seal, confirming Matisiṃha in his kingly office In return the Nepalese king sent a gift containing a gold shrine and sacred books to Peking. This exchange of mission took place again in 1390 A. D. and 1413 A D. Syāmasiṃha also recieved a seal confirming his

Harisiṃha, who probably ruled from Bhaṭagāon. But, the Colophons to the dated Mss- of Nepal reveal that there was a continuous series of three kings who claimed to rule there.[1] It is possible that the princes mentioned in the colophons were subordinate to the line of Harisiṃhadeva at Bhaṭagāon. If so, it can safely be concluded that while Harisiṃhadeva and his descendants exercised effective control over the whole of the Nepal valley they left undisturbed the local rulers in the possession of two other capitals, Pāṭan and Kāṭhamāṇḍū—who acknowledged their suzerainty. The statements in the Vaṃśāvali and the Nepalese inscriptions show that during the reign of the line of Harisiṃha, the Khaśas under Ādityamalla again invaded Nepal in the winter of 448, i. e., 1328 A.D., and Jayarudramalla, the Malla prince (1320-26 A. D.) died just at the time of this invasion.[2]

The following period is obscure in the history of Nepal. It appears, however, that after a brief interval, two immediate successors of Śyāmasiṃha ruled from 1387 to 1413 A.D., reigning probably contemporaneously with Jayasthitimalla who captured the throne of the Mallas and, through matrimonial alliances with the later Karṇāṭas (by marrying Rājalladevī) claimed to be the legitimate

accession. These accounts clearly show that the successors of Harisiṃhadeva were regarded as genuine rulers of Nepal by the Chinese Emperor. (Also cf. Annals, XXXV, pp. 118-19).

1. DHNI. I, 219 ff; Bendall, Intro. in CPMDN. p. 14; Levi, Le Nepal, II, 230 ff
2. Le Nepal. II, 226; DHNI. I, 221.

representative of the Mallas and the Sūryavaṃśī Karṇāṭas.[1] After 1418 A. D. the descendants of Harisiṃha, however, lost all power in the Nepal valley, which is quite consistent with the fact that the Chinese in 1427 A.D. got no response from them, when the emperor Hiuen-te tried to renew friendly relations.[2]

Thus, after a rule of two centuries and a quarter over Mithilā, and a direct rule of about a century over the Nepal valley, the celebrated Karṇāṭa dynasty made its tragic exit from the political stage of Northern India. The rule of this dynasty, however, left its indelible marks on the sands of the time, so far as the Sanskrit learning is concerned. Smṛtic studies were renewed and considerably developed by Caṇḍeśvara and his family. On rhetoric and erotics some of the most popular books were written. Literary compositions comprising the Commentary of Bhavadatta on the epic-poem *Naiṣadha-caritam;* the Commentarv of Pṛthvīdhara Ācārya on the drama *Mṛcchakaṭikā;* lexicon, represented by Śrīkara's Commentary on the *Amarakoṣa;* Śrīnivāsa's *Bhaṭṭikāvyaṭīkā;* Śrīdhara's *Kāvyaprakāśaviveka* and Jyotirīśvara's *Varṇanaratnākara* (the earliest extant work in Maithilī language) etc. illumined the age,[3] which shine and will shine the brightest for all ages to come. Mithilā was, indeed, turned into the home and centre of Sanskrit learning, and the courts of the kings presented the site of big literary-halls,

1. Bendall, op. cit. 12-14; Mitra-Majumdar, Vidyāpati (Hindi). p. 38.
2. DHNI. I, 222-24, 226; Journey by Bendall, 83-87 & 11-12. For other view cf. Annals, XXXV. 119-20.
3. JASB. 1915 (N. S.), p. 414.

wherein flocked the literary gems of the period and argued out their point of disputes. The remains of Śimrāon lying scattered and uncared for in the Nepalese low-lands are enough to make one "form a just idea of what the Hindus of Mithilā achieved prior to the advent of the Muslims".[1] The ailing ruins and the cursed palaces are the living tales of "five centuries of incessant struggle between Muslim bigotry and Hindu retaliation".[2]

1. JASB. IV. 121.
2. Ibid.

CHAPTER VI

THE OINAVĀRAS

(Circa 1353 A. D.—1526 A. D.)

With the fall of the Karṇāṭas of Mithilā, the Muslim conquest of the whole of North Bihar was completed. The Brāhmaṇa dynasty (*i.e.*, the Oinavāra or the Thākura dynasty) that substituted the Karṇāṭas was nothing but the creation of the Sultan of Delhi who gave the kingdom to Kāmeśvara Thakkura (or Thākura), the founder of the family in c. 1353 A. D., about thirty years after the flight of Harisiṃha into the forests of Nepal. The intervening period witnessed no ruler, *de-facto* or *de-jure* except the Muslim conqueror and his relentless governors. For about 30 years a scene of indiscriminate embezzlement and lawlessness dominated her political stage.[1].

The list of twentythree provinces comprising the empire of Muhammad Tughlak does not include the name of Tirhut. But, it is probable that of the two Teliṅgas (Nos. 11 and 23) one might be a misreading for Tirhut, and if

1. Prof R. K. Chowdhary believes that "though the Karṇāṭas were defeated, some local chieftains were ruling in Mithilā side by side with the Oinavāra dynasty whose capital was at Sugaunā in Madhubani sub-division " (Vide -JBRS. XL. 99). We have. however, no information about these local chieftains. All available evidences tend to show that there was no stable government in Mithilā for about 30 years. She passed through a state of "matsya-nyāya".

so, the claim would not be without foundation[1]. After Muhammad Tughlak, Tirhut once more figures in the account of the first invasion of Bengal by Sultan Feroz Shah. From the account recorded by Barni we know that the Sultan marched towards Lakhanāutī (Lakhanāwati) through Gorakhpur, Kharos and Tirhut[2]. The Rāis of the first two tracts submitted and followed to Lakhānautī. Shams-i-Siraj' Afif gives us a more detailed account of this historic march. According to him, when the Sultan reached the bank of the Kośī (?Gaṇḍaka) near its junction with the Gaṅgā he found the passage difficult and the enemy's army posted in force on the opposite side (probably at Hajipur, said to have been founded by the then Bengal king Haji Ilyas Shah). The Sultan, therefore, marched up the river for 100 Kos, and below Camparan, where the river was found fordable, crossing it by a living bridge of elephants. Then via Camparan and Racap he moved on towards Paṇḍuah[3]. Barni states that Feroz Shah left Delhi on the 10th Shawwal 754 H. (Nov. 8, A. D. 1355) and returned to it on the 12th Sha'ban 755 H. (1st December, 1355). The march through Tirhut must have, therefore, taken place in the winter of 1355 A. D. as the rivers in the winter would have fallen low and would, therefore, be favourable to the crossing of cavalry and elephants. According to Manmohan Chakravarti, Barni's Kharos lying

1. Thomas, Chronicles of the Pathan Kings of Delhi, 203, fn. I; JASB. 1915 (N. S.), pp. 412-13; Briggs, I. 407 ff.
2. Tarikh-in-Firozshahi. Elliot, III. p. 124.
3. Elliot. III. 293-94.

between Gorakhpur and Tirhut is probably to be identified with Camparan (Campakāraṇya).[1]

Tirhut was thus a dependency of the empire of Delhi and Tughlak Shah placed it under Kāmeśvara Thākura, who founded the Oinavāra or Sugaunā dynasty. It appears that the Muslim conquerors adopted different policies towards different places. They left Hindu Rājās or Chiefs undisturbed in their possession at certain places while at others they appointed new men as ruling chiefs. But in either case they did not interfere in the internal administration so long as the rulers paid them tribute. The new Brāhmaṇa rulers of Mithilā, though independent in their internal affairs, were fully dependent on the Delhi Sultanate in external affairs. Moreover, owing to the Bengal power which kept on troubling the Oinavāra subordinates of Delhi, and the rivalry between Delhi and Gauḍa, these kings had no alternative but to look to the Sultan for help in times of need.[2] A slight deviation or exhibition of independent character in abiding by the directives of the Sultans was enough to cost their throne as did actually happen in the case of Kāmeśvara, the first king of the line.

The Oinavāras—Origin

The line of the Maithila Brāhmaṇa kings who ruled over Mithilā from c. 1353 A. D. to the early part of the 16th

1. JASB. 1915 (N. S.), p. 413; also see JBRS. XL, 99-101; Ain-i-Tirhut, 20 ff; JBORS. 1936, pp. 81-91; Al Badaoni, I, 309, 317 & 324; Rahmani, Mithilā, dated 16th Feb 1953, p. 6. etc; For details see Chap. VIII.
2. JBORS. XXII. 86.

century is known in history as the Oinavāra line or the Sugaunā dynasty. Tradition avers that these Oinavāras were the Kāśyapagotrīya Maithila Brāhmaṇas of "Khauār-jagatpura" origin. One Jayapati was born in this line whose son was Hiṅgu. O'ena (or Nātha) Ṭhakura was the latter's son. O'ena Thākura was a great scholar and practised asceticism. He is also said to have served some of the Karṇāṭa kings who, in recognition of his profound scholarship and meritorious services, crowned him with the village of Oinī. This village still exists in the district of Muzaffarpur and constitutes a small Railway station on the Muzaffarpur line. Since then he came to be reckoned as of Oinī origin The custom prevalent in those days was that a man, who got a certain village as a gift or reward from the ruler, usually came to be known after the name of that particular village. This convention has been zealously preserved by the Maithilas even to the present day[1]. Another tradition goes that the members of this family were all learned and as such exercised a considerable influence in literary circles as well as the Royal Durbār. It was again their vast learning that helped to secure the village of Sodarapura for them. They are, therefore, also mentioned as 'Sodarapurīya origin".[2] Later they came to be known as "Śrotiyas" as the Pañjī-Prabandha of Harisiṃhadeva records. But, with the advance of time, a remarkable change was perceptible in their titles and sub-titles. Originally entitled as "Thākura" they also came to be christened as "Miśra", "Upādhyāya" (Ojhā, Jhā etc.).

1. cf. Pañjī—prabandha.
2. P. Jha, Op. Cit. 147.

O'ena Thākura had a son named Atirūpa. His son was Viśvarūpa, The latter's son was Govinda and Govinda's son was Lakṣmaṇa Thākura. He had six sons. 1) Kāmeśvara (the Rāja-Paṇḍita, probably in the court of Harisiṃhadeva), (2) Harṣaṇa (Hariṣaṇa), (3) Tripura, (4) Tevārī, (5) Salakhana (Salakṣaṇa), and (6) Gauḍa[1]. Of all these, only Kāmeśvara emerges as a historical figure.

Kāmeśvara Thākura

Kāmeśvara was the first king of this line. Vardhamāna in his Gaṅgā Kṛtya-Viveka describes him as having "actually" ruled in Mithilā ("*Kāmeśo Mithilām aśāsat*"[2]). But, Vidyāpati in his Kīrttilatā[3] gives him the epithets of only Rāi and Rāja-Paṇḍita. From this some scholars infer[4] that he had not become the king of Mithilā. But Eggeling, on the basis of evidences gleaned from the Durgā-Bhakti-Taraṅginī or Durgotsavapaddhati written by Vidyāpati under the auspices of Bhairavasiṃha, a later king of this line, and other works, has given a list of the kings of this line which is supported by the narrative records which make Kāmeśvara, the first king[5].

1. Ibid. 147.
2. Br. Mus. Cat. p. 75, No. 198. Intro verse 2.
3. Ind. Govt. Ms. 2nd pallava, p. 3 ; Dāna-vākyāvali (Mitra, Notices, V. 137, No. 1830 ; Bhandarkar, Report for 1883-84, p. 382), Intro. verse 3 : "श्रीकामेश्वरराजपंडितकुलालङ्कार"
4. JASB. 1915, p. 415.
5. I. O. Cat. IV. No. 2564; IA. IV. 299 seq; Grierson, Maithili Chrestomathy and also the 'extra-number' to JASB. 1882; IA. XIV. 182 seq

The epithets, "Rāi" and "Rāja-Paṇḍita" probably show that he was formerly in the court of the Karṇāṭa kings. He upheld these titles to the last inspite of his elevated position. Moreover, the description of his son as "the jewel ornamenting the *śrotiya-vaṃśa*" and the word "*vipra*", given to another of his descendants prove that the family was Brāhmaṇical.

We have no further information about Kāmeśvara. He ruled for a very short period and was probably deposed by Feroz Shah who gave the throne to Bhogīśvara, the younger son of Kāmeśvara who was his personal friend.[1] What actually prompted the Shah to take this rather drastic step we do not know.[2] The contemporary literature is almost silent on the issue. The traditional accounts lend to indirectly suggest that Kāmeśvara voluntarily abdicated in favour of his son. According to some scholars,[3] however, Kāmeśvara did not accept the throne offered to him by Feroz Shah, This supposition is wide the mark.[4]

1. MDG. 19.
2. Rahmani gives an interesting story regarding this episode (cf. 'Mithilā', dated 16th Feb. 1953. p. 6) : Also see **ante**. VIII.
3 Umesh Mishra, Vidyāpati Thākura (Hindi), P. 17.
4. Maithila scholars believe that Kāmeśvara was persuaded by the Emperor Firoz to accept the rulership of Mithilā (P. Jha, Op. Cit. 147-48). Kāmeśvara did not like to shoulder the responsibility and requested Firoz to nominate Bhogīśvara who was his friend. Another local tradition asserts that Muhammad Tughlak handed over the kingdom to Kāmeśvara in 1340 A. D. (Hijri 741) and directed Shamsuddin Ilyas of Bengal to realise the tribute and supervise the kingdom (Rahmani, Op. Cit. 16th February 1953, p. 6). The second source reaches the truth nearer and seems more reliable (JBRS. XL. 101).

Bhogīśvara Thākura

Kāmeśvara left behind at least two sons, Bhogīśvara and Bhaveśa.[1] The former succeeded his father and the elder branch probably continued for two genarations more.[2] From Vidyāpati's Padāvali we learn that like his father he bore the title of "Rāya". Padmādevī was his wife[3]. He was a personal friend of the Sultan. Feroz is represented as having addressed Bhogīśvara as "*priya śakhā*" (dear friend[4]). According to some scholars this must have taken place between 1353 and 1355 A. D., on Feroz's return to Delhi from the first invasion of Bengal.[5]

1. According to the Pañjī he had three sons—(i) Bhogīśvara, (ii) Kusumeśvara and (iii) Bhaveśvara (" राजवंहित कामेश्वर स्नुताराजा भोगीश्वर महामत्तक कुसुमेश्वर महाराजाधिराज भवेश्वरा:.... महीपाल दौहित्र: "). Tradition goes that Kāmeśvara had no son and Bhogīśvara looked after the State, and Bhaveśvara contented himself with having shared a part of the State. Another tradition, however, records that Kāmeśvara had four sons- (i) Bhogīśvara, (ii) Kusumeśvara, (iii) Bhaveśvara and (iv) Lakṣmīkara. The three younger brothers separated from their eldest brother, ie., Bhogīśvara, each having his own legitimate share—(M. Jha, Op. Cit. 513). Though shrouded in vagueness these sources definitely tend to indicate that Bhogīśvara and Bhaveśa were Kāmeśvara's sons.
2. JASB. 1915 (N. S.), p. 415.
3. "राउ भोगीसर गुन नागर रे पद्मादेवि रमान"
4. "मति कामेसर सन राए, तसु नंदन भोगीस राव वरभोग पुरन्दर....पियसखि भणि पिअरोज साह सुरतान समानल" (Kīrttilatā, p. 1; Ind. Govt. Ms. 2nd pallava, p. 4).
5. JBRS. XL 4; JBORS. xiii. 297.

Tradition credits him with a reign-period of 33 years.[1] Even if it be true it is, indeed, strange that a long span of thirty years' reign could have been so uneventful. No Vidyāpati or any other chronicler of the time enlightens us on the period even in the least.

Gaṇeśvara Thākura

Gaṇeśvara succeeded his father Bhogīśvara. It seems, his accession was not smooth. There was split among the nobles who were divided into two camps. One group supported the claim of Bhavasiṃha, the younger brother of Bhogīśvara, and the other favoured the accession of Gaṇeśvara. But the following events indicate that the controversy did not assume a fierce proportion and was successfuly hushed up, the final verdict being cast in favour of Ganeśvara. Some local scholars hold that the matter did not end there. Bhaveśvara (Bhaveśa or Bhavasiṃha) though quietly submitted to this decision, his sons–princes Harisiṃha and Tripurasiṃha—got enraged, conspired against and finally succeeded in killing Gaṇeśvara with the help of one Arjuna Rai and Ratnākara.[2] Vidyāpati, on the other hand, states that he (Gaṇeśvara) was treacherously killed (L. S. 252, i. e., 1371) A. D. by one Aslān evidently a Muslim, who wanted to usurp

1. Mishra, Vidyāpati Thākura, 17. According to Dr. Jayakant Mishra he ruled C. 1353-1370/1 A. D. (HML. I, App. II, p. 465). Mithilā tradition asserts that he died in 1360 A. D. which seems more correct. (cf. JBRS. XL. 102).
2. P. Jha. Op. Cit. 149.

the throne of Mithilā.[1] The latter's plan, however, seems to have been foiled, for the sons of Gaṇeśvara—Vīrasiṃha, Kīrttisiṃha and Rājasiṃha, with the timely help of Ibrahim Shah defeated Malik Aslān and killed him. Vīrasiṃha was also killed in this battle. Ibrahim Shah made Kīrttisiṃha, his younger brother, the king of Mithilā[2]. Monmohan Chakravarti doubts the genuineness of this passage and dismisses it as "corrupt".[3] This piece of information, is however, quite in keeping with the events related in the history of Jaunpur by Muhammedan historians who have recorded the minute details of Ibrahim's march to Tirhut. Vidyāpati also says that the Sultan (Ibrahim Shah) at once ordered a march on hearing the petition of the princes. But, the army moved towards the west, instead of east, and crossed territories unopposed. After some time when the Tirhut princes thought that the Sultan had altogether forgotten them, things suddenly changed and Ibrahim marched on to Tirhut. This seems to answer Ibrahim Shah's advance on Kālpi and then his sudden retirement in 1435 A. D. without coming to any engagement[4].

The above date (L. S. 252, *i.e.*, 1371 A. D.) is doubtful and falls outside the reign-period of Ibrahim Shah

1. "रज्जलुब्ध असलाने बुद्धि विक्कमबले हारल, पास बइसि विसवासि राए गएनेसर मारल"(Kīrttilatā, Ed, Saksena, p. 75; JBORS.XIII. 297; Ind. Govt. Ms. 2nd pallava, p. 2).
2. "महराग्न्हि मल्लिकेन चप्पि लिऊन, असलान मानहु गिट्ठि दिऊन.." (Kirttilatā, pallava 4).
3. JASB. 1915 (N. S.). p. 416.
4. Ferishta, Briggs IV, 366; JBORS. XIII, 297-98; JBRS. XL. 111-12.

(1401–1440 A. D.). Jayaswal suggests that the interpretation of date L. S. 252 given by Haraprasad Sastri[1] should be L. S. 304, corresponding to 1423 A. D. (304+1119), which does fall within his reign-period. Ibrahim's march to Tirhut, according to him, was, therefore, in a year subsequent to 1423, probably before 1435 A.D.[2]. Jayakanta Mishra supports Sastri's interpretation of L. S. 252 and holds that Ibrahim Shah re-instated Kīrttisiṃha in 1401 A. D. when the former came to the throne. The gap (between 1371 A. D., the date of Gaṇeśvara's death and 1401 A.D., the date of Ibrahim's accession to the throne), according to him, can be explained by assuming these princes as "minors" at the time of their father's death, though "this would be an unusually long period of unrest". He bases his objection mainly on a particular term "*Khelanakavi*" (*i.e.*, Vidyāpati was a play-mate of Kīrttisiṃha) which could not have been possible in 304 L. S. as the poet is known to have finished the copying of the Bhāgavata in 309 L. S. saṃ, and Lakhanāvali in L. S. 299[3].

Vidyāpati clearly says that the two princes of Gaṇeśvara bravely fought and beat back the enemy with the help of Ibrahim Shah, which is consistent with the records of Muslim historians, only if we take the date to be 304 L.S. This also, disapproves of the theory of their being "minors". The term "*Khelanakavi*" does not seriously stand in our way for it only shows that they were intimate friends. The

1. Kīrttilatā, Ed. Sastri, II, 2.
2. JBORS. XIII. 299-300. Also cf. Mitra-Majumdar, Vidyāpati (Hindī), p. 34.
3. HML. I, 138, fn. 18.

date of the composition of Kīrttilatā (c. 1402—05 A. D.)[1] also tends to support this assertion[2].

In Haraprasad Sāstri's edition of *Kīrttilatā* (p. 10) we have the word *Jonāpura*, which is supposed to mean Jaunpur. The first stanza that describes this city of Jaunpur runs as follows: "*pekkharīañ paṭṭana cāru mekhala jañona-nīra pakhāria.*" According to Dr. Subhadra Jha[3] this *jañona* stands for the river, *Yamunā*. On this basis he thinks that the *Jonāpura* of Sāstri's edition could not have been Jaunpur. On the other hand it was probably *Yoginī-*

1. Ibid. 139, fn. 21.
2. R. K. Chowdhary has dwelt at length on all the aspects relating to this Gaṇeśvara-murder-episode (JBRS. XL. 102-09). He is inclined to believe that " this Arslān was an imaginary character, found out by our poet (Vidyāpati) to cover up the rotten atmosphere of the court which had culminated in the murder of Gaṇeśvara. Political unstability and internal stife enabled the Muslims to make frequent inroads into the country and when Vīrasiṃha and Kīrttisiṃha came of age, they took upon themselves the responsibility of freeing and making Mithilā strong" (p. 107). From the contemporary records it is clear that after 1370 A.D. anarchy prevailed for sometime in Mithilā (Kīrttilatā. pallava 2). It is true that in the medieval history of India fatricidal war for succession to the throne was not very uncommon, and Mithilā also may not have proved an exception. But it does not seem desirable to treat this Aslān as " an imaginary figure ". It seems more probable that he was some local Muslim upstart who wanted to take advantage of the disturbed condition of the Maithila kingdom, due to inernal strifes and dissensions.

   For general political condition of N. E. India of the period, see chap. VIII.
3. The Songs of Vidyāpati, p. 41.

pura (ancient Delhi) and Ibrahim Shah was "a chief military officer" under Firoz Shah Tughlak. Dr. Jha is, however, himself "not definite about the identity of Jonāpura or Ibrahim Shah." If it be a fact, then the difficulty postulated by Jayaswal regarding the interpretation of the date L.S. 252 or 1371 A. D. is solved[1]. But, we know that the description given by Vidyāpati of *Jonāpura* tallies more or less with that given by contemporary Muslim historians, that the Muslim historians must have given the name of so important a General like Ibrahim Shah as they have recorded the minute details and that the decaying Tughlak Empire was not in a position to send its army to such a long distance when its own house was on fire. Dr. Jha's conclusion, therefore, goes against all established historical facts of the medieval history of India. It is as such difficult to arrive at any definite conclusion in the present state of our knowledge.

It appears probable that during the time of Gaṇeśvara, certain parts of the Maithila territory were given to Bhavasiṃha leading to the virtual division of kingdom. Thus, for some time there were two kings ruling over the small territories side by side[2].

A great lover of literature and art Gaṇeśvara zealously patronised scholars in his court, and thereby kept up the tradition of his ancestors[3].

1. Ibid. 38-44.
2. Mishra, Vidyāpati Thākura, p. 17; JBRS. XL· 105; Mitra-Majumdar, Vidyapati, p. 32.
3. Mishra, 17.

Kīrttisiṃha

Kīrttisiṃha was the second son of Gaṇeśvara. Vīrasiṃha was the elder one, whom Vidyāpati in his Kīrttilatā gives the epithet of Mahārājādhirāja[1]. We have also a Ms. of *Liṅgavārtika* dated L. S. 228/1347 A. D. referring to Vīrasiṃha's reign. Despite all this, it is doubtful if he ever became king. As regards his epithet 'Mahārājādhirāja', we know that ministers like Caṇḍeśvara and Rāmadatta also bore this title as is evident from the colophons of their works[2]. Moreover, he is said to have been killed in the battle against the Muslim invader Aslān, referred to above.

His early career was full of storms and strides. Vidyāpati says that like Bāli, Rāmacandra, Paraśurāma, etc., Kīrttisiṃha crushed his enemies in the battle-field and ferociously revenged upon them[3]. That Bhogīśvara was a contemporary of Feroz Shah is quite in consonance with the datum that Vidyāpati's patron and friend Kīrttisiṃha was a contemporay of Ibrahim Shah, the illustrious Sharqi king of Jaunpur[4]. It is, however, a fact that from the time of the coronation of Kīrttisiṃha to 1460 A. D. Mithilā was a vassal state of Jaunpur[5].

He bore the title of "Rāya-guru" and recovered his patrimony. About his other political activities we have no information either in Kīrttilatā, or in any other contempo-

1. Ind. Govt. Ms. 2nd pallava, p. 4.
2. cf. JASB, 1915 (N. S.), p. 416; JBRS. XL. 111, also pp. 108-11.
3. Kīrttilatā, 1st pallava. Int. V. 5; Jha, op. cit. 150.
4. For his exploits in Mithilā. see chap. VIII.
5. HB. II. 135; Mitra-Majumdar, Vidyāpati, 34.

rary books. Literary activities, however, found a great impetus during his time. Besides Vidyāpati the great Mathiila poet, Dāmodara Miśra the author of "Vāṇībhūṣaṇa" also flourished during this time. His patronage of learning can easily be judged from the "Kīrttilatā" which constitutes a living monument to his glory and fame.

He probably ruled between 1402 and 1410 A. D.[1]

Bhavasiṃhadeva

The accession of Bhavasiṃha to the throne of Mithilā marks a complete departure from the elder branch for neither Kīrttisiṃha nor Vīrasiṃha nor Rājasiṃha had any issue. It was, therefore, the younger son of Kāmeśvara named Bhavasiṃha or Bhaveśa who succeeded him[2]. He must have been old at the time of his coronation. His advent, nevertheless, strikes a greater significance for he was the first Oinavāra ruler of the whole of Mithilā, two parts having been subsequently re-united. Vidyāpati generally refers to him by his fuller name "Bhavasiṃha". But in his *Vibhāgasāra*, in Vācaspati Miśra's *Vivādacandra* and in Vardhamāna's *Gaṅgākṛtya-Viveka* Bhavasiṃha's name has been shortened to Bhaveśa[3].

Bhaveśa is said to have been a great warrior. There was peace and plenty everywhere in his kingdom. He is represented as having defeated scores of enemies. According to the author of the Kandahā Inscription he

1. JBRS. XL. 112.
2. JASB. 1915 (N. S.), p. 417.
3. Ibid 417. In the Kandahā Inscription he bas been referred to by his fuller name : "पृथ्वीपति द्विजवरो भव(सिंह) . . . ." (Vide— JBORS. XX. 17.)

was an "excellent Brāhmaṇa", and a "collection of white fame", i. e., "his fame was white".[1] Vidyāpati in his "Śaivasarvasvasāra" describes him as such a powerful and dreaded king that the petty kings (chieftains ?) bowed down to his feet spinelessly.[2] If this account is to be believed then it may be said that he conquered the whole of Northern India if not the whole of India. But the truth is that the petty potentates lay prostrate before the mighty Delhi Sultans who could depose them with a mere stroke of pen. The exaggerated statements in Vidyāpati's works probably suggest that Bhavasiṃha was a "brave" king and easily beat the enemies within, who fomented domestic troubles and intrigues.

Bhavasiṃha performed several sacrifices and gave gifts to the Brāhmaṇas. He had three queens. Two of them practised *satī* on the death of their husband, on the bank of the Vāgmatī river before the Lord Śiva.[3]

Bhavasiṃha died quite an old man, probably after a reign-period of 30 years which also include the period when he ruled over a part, and not the whole, of Mithilā.

Bhavasiṃha's time was marked with great literary and intellectual fervour. Gonū Jhā, a matchless humorist and a man of inexhaustible wits flourished in about the same period. His name has now passed for a household word in Mithilā. Moreover, he was a great scholar

Ibid. 16-17.

"गंगो हुगतरगिता मल्लसत् कीर्तिच्छटाक्षालिन क्षोणीक्ष्मातल सर्वपर्वतवरो वीरत्रतालंकृत:. . . ." (Quoted, Mishra, Vidyapati Thakura).

"वाग्वत्यां भवसिंहदेव नृपतिस्त्यक्त्वा शिवाग्रो वपु. ." (Puruṣa-parīkṣā, end verse No. 1).

of his time.[1] In about the same period the great Maithila philosopher Gaṅgeśa Upādhyāya also flourished. His "Nyāya-tattva-cintāmaṇi" is an outstanding work on Nyāya, yet unexcelled. He was also an outstanding *Mīmaṃsaka.* Another great name in the realm of philosophy was his son and disciple Vardhamāna Upādhyāya. From the statement of Murāri, the author of "Śuddhi-nibandha" we learn that his great-grandfather was the chief judge in the court of Bhavasiṃha.[2]

Devasiṃha

Devasiṃha was the eldest son and successor of Bhavasiṃha. With him began the elder branch of the junior family continuing up to Padmasiṃha. He had a viruda "*Garuḍa-nārāyaṇa*", the first to be authentically traced.[3] He probably deserted Oinī and made his new capital at Devakulī, after his own name.[4] The cause of his sudden desertion of ancestral kingdom may be ascribed to the constant domestic strifes and dissensions between the descendants of the elder branch and those of the younger one. He married one Hāsinī Devī, the daughter of Mahāmahopādhyāya Rāmeśvara.[5]

1. The Pañjī records his name as follows: "सोन करियाम कर्महासं बीजी वंशोधरः ....महामहोपाध्याय हरिकेश महाधूर्तराज, गोनूकः...."
2. JASB. 1915 (N. S.), p. 417.
3. Ibid. 417.
4. IA. 1899. p. 57; Singh, 72. Dekulī or Devakulī is situated well over two miles north of the present Darbhanga court.
5. Padāvali (Beng. Ed.) , song no. 269.

According to Monmohan Chakravarti the date of Devasiṃha's accession to the throne falls in c. 1342 A. D. (1263 Śaka) and he must have lived before L. S. 299 (*Pauṣa sudī* 9, Monday 3rd January 1417 A. D.), when a Nepal Ms. of Śrīdatta's *Eka-Agni-Dānapaddhati* was copied, and also before L. S. 291 (*Kārttika Vadi* 10) when the copying of a Ms. of Śrīdhara's commentary on the *Kāvya-prakāśa* by order of Vidyāpati was completed, (when Śivasiṃha was ruling Tīrabhukti).[1] According to a verse composed by Vidyāpati, Devasiṃha died on Thursday, the sixth of the dark half of the month *Caitra* in the year Lakṣmaṇasena-era 293 and Śaka year 1324.[2] Now, this Śaka year 1324 or 1403 A. D. does not agree with La. Saṃ. 293 or 1411 or 1412 A.D. and is further inconsistent with the year of copying of the commentary, La. Saṃ. 291, when Devasiṃha was still ruling. So, this verse is either "spurious" or contains some "mistakes"[3] in the dates given. This is all the more probable, for in course of centuries numerous interpolations must have crept in distorting the original verse. On calculation the *Caitra vadi* 6th falls on Thursday in 1413 A. D. (March 23) which is equivalent to Śaka 1334 and La. Saṃ. 293 (expired). The Śaka year should, therefore, be corrected to 1334.

1. JASB. 1915 (N. S.), p. 418; Nepal Mss. Notices, 129; Kāvya-prakāśa-viveka, (Ind. Govt. Ms. fol. 117 a): "इति .. सम्भूज्यमान तीरभुक्तौ श्रीगजरथपुर नगरे..ल० सं० २६१, कार्त्तिक वदि १०(१)". A copy of this Ms. is also preserved in the (Royal) Asiatic Society of Bengal.
2 "अनलरन्ध्रकर (२९३) लक्खण हरवै सक समुद्रकर अगिनि ससी (१३२४) .. देवसिंह सुरपुर चलिओ"— Padavali, 2.
3. JASB. 1915 (N. S.), p. 419.

As regards the dates given in these Mss. written in the period, they fall in sharp contrast with each other, and are seldom consistent with the records of the contemporary Muhammadan historians. It is difficult to reconcile these varying dates which often flout the established dates and facts of history. Even if the date 1413 A. D., referred to above, be correct it is difficult to accept it, keeping in view the narrow margin it allows for the preceding two kings. It is all probably due to the miscalculation of the Lakṣmaṇa Saṃvat by the local scholars. This creates a rather knotty problem, and makes reliance on these dates extremely doubtful.

Devasiṃha was a great warrior like his ancestors as Vidyāpati in his *Puruṣa-parīkṣā*[1] and *Saiva-sarvasvasāra*[2] describes him to be. But of the enemies defeated and crushed by him we have no mention at all. Most of these praises are just conventional ones without any foundation whatsoever. He is also said to have been one of the most generous kings of Mithilā. Brāhmaṇas recieved gifts including chariots and golden elephants. He also performed the ' *tulā-puruṣa*" ceremony and distributed gold among the Brāhmaṇas.[3] Moreover, he has to his credit several tanks, the largest of all being situated in the *śāsana* of Śaṅkarapura, i. e., Sakurī, a station on the N. E. Rly. line in Darbhanga district.[4]

1. "भाति यस्य जनकोरणजेता देवसिंह नृपतिः"
2. Mitra, Notices VI. p. 3. Int. verse 4.
3. "दत्तं येन द्विजेभ्यो....कनकमय तुलापुरुषो येन दत्तः..देवोऽसौ देवसिंह"
4. Mitra, Notices VI : "सक्कुरीपुर सरोवर कर्त्ता...." ie., "he (Sivasiṃha) whose father is illustrious as the victorious king Devasiṃha who dug the lake at Sakkurīpura...."

Above all, he was a great patron of learning and gave the scholars their due honour and respect. Vidyāpati says that he was "honoured among great heroes" and his name "headed the list of them that are full of learning".[1] It was by his order that Vidyāpati wrote *Bhū-parikramā* which describes the travel of Baladeva from the Naimiṣya forest to Janakadeśa (Mithilā) in the course of which he was told light moral tales.[2] It was again with his consent that Śrīdatta compiled the Smṛtic *Ak-Agni Dānapaddhati*.[3] Harihara, the grandfather of Murāri, was chief judge in his court. Dharmādhikārī Mahāmahopādhyāya Abhinava Vardhamāna Upādhyāya also belonged to his court, which we learn from his book *Smṛti-tattvāmṛta*. In Devakulī there yet exists a temple of "Vardhamānesvava", whose erections tradition attributes to Vardhamāna Upādhyāya.[4]

Devasiṃha had two sons—Śivasiṃha and Padmasiṃha by his queen Hāsinī Devī, of whom the former succeeded his father.

Śivasiṃha

Śivasiṃha was the most famous king of the line. Vidyāpati compiled *Puruṣa-parīkṣa* by his order. His *Kīrttilatā*, "an amatory poem in the vernacular" contains praises of Śivasiṃha. His Padāvali "a celebrated collection

1. "वीरेषु मान्याः सुधियां वरण्योः.." (IA. XIV. 111).
2. Skt. Coll. Ms. VI. 7a (fol. Ia), Intro. Vs. 2-3; Singh 71.
3. Skt. Coll. Ms. VI. 7a (fol. Ia), Intro. Vs. 2-3.
4. There is yet a stone-pillar bearing the following verse: "जाते वंशे बिल्वपञ्चाभिधाने धर्माध्यक्षो वर्धमानो भवेशात्...."

of stray songs and one of the most popular in Indian literature" sings throughout the praises of this king. He also bore the viruda "*Rūpa-nārāyaṇa*" as mentioned in the final colophons of the second and fourth chapters of *Puruṣa-parīkṣā*, and the Padāvali.[1] In Padāvali Śivasiṃha's name figurs in no less than 112 songs and alone in 17 songs.

Śivasiṃha's was a stormy career. It is said, when nearly 15 he had started taking active part in the administration of his father. The capital from Devakulī was transferred to Gajarathapura or Śivasiṃhapura, founded after his name. It was from Gajarathapura that the deed of endowment granting Bisapī (Bisaphī) to Vidyāpati was issued : "from Gajarathapura—the victorious feet of king illumined with all prerogatives .."[2] What actually prompted him to take this action is not at all hinted at in the contemporary literature. Probably the domestic trouble was at the root of all this. Moreover, the harassment by Muslim invaders compelled in the course of time several other kings of this line to change their seat of government.

1. No. 21 : "रूपनारायण इ रस जानथि शिवसिंह मिथिलाभूपे"
2. IA. XIV. 190 : स्वस्ति । गजरथेत्यादि--समस्तप्रक्रियाविराजमान· · · · रूपनारायण महाराजाधिराज श्रीमच्छिवसिंहदेवपादाः समरविजयिनः जरइलतप्पायां विसपीग्रामवास्तव्य सकललोकान् भूकर्षकांश्च समादिशन्ति । " Also cf. S. N. Thakur, Mahākavi Vidyāpati, 8-9. It is said that this copper-plate is still kept with Srī Ratikant Choudhary of village Pindaruchha, Darbhanga.

This Gajarathapura or Sivasiṃhapura, from where the Copper plate-grant was issued, is now a village, four or five miles south-east of Darbhanga. There were heaps of ruins lying scattered over the area which has now been converted into ploughable land. So, even the last vestiges have been wiped out.

Śivasiṃha took over the charge of the administration while probably his old father was alive. Vidyāpati, the celebrated poet, was his "friend, guide, and philosopher", who acted both as the adviser and chronicler. The final verse of the *Puruṣa-parīkṣā* says that Śivasiṃha earned great fame by fighting against the forces of the kings of Gauḍa and Gajjana[1]. The verse, while giving the date of Devasiṃha's death, speaks of the Yavana forces attacking Śivasiṃha. This was probably his fight with the Sultan of Jaunpur (Sharqi Dynasty)[2]. The situation, though extre-

1. IA. XIV. 192 :

"यो गौड़ेश्वर गज्जनेश्वर रणक्षौणीषु लब्ध्वा यशो
दिक्कान्ताचय कुन्तलेषु नयते कुन्द स्रजामास्पदम्
तस्य श्री शिवसिंहदेवनृपतेर्व्विज्ञप्रियस्याज्ञया
ग्रंथं ग्रन्थिल दण्डनीतिविषये विद्यापतिर्व्यतनोत्

Also cf. Saiva-sarvasvasāra (Mitra, Notices, VI, p 3, Int. verse 5) : "शौर्यावर्जित गौड़ महीपाऽापनम्रीकृता नेकोत्तुङ्ग, जाश्च कनकच्छत्राभिरामोदय: "

"He (Sivasiṃha) after (gaining glory in a terrible battle with the king of Gauḍa and with (him of) Gajjana is conducting it to its home......"

2. It is said that the Sharqi king was Ibrāhim Shah who was defeated by Sivasiṃha. This is impossible as Ibrahim was engaged with Delhi between 1405 and 1416 A. D. Probably his representative went to suppress the rising in Bengal, and on return tried to bring under control Sivasiṃha who had assumed independence and had struck gold coins.

The term **Gajjan** was probably used in the from of an epithet for the Sharqi king or his representative. Gajjaneśvara signified the Muslim king, and not the king of Ghazni as held by Singh (p. 73). He also identified Gajjan with a Muslim State near Tirhut (cf. JBRS. XL. 116). Had Mithilā been a dependent state on Sharqi kingdom in Sivasiṃha's time there was no necessity of any further invasion against that State.

mely critical, Śivasiṃha rose equal to the occasion and defeated and chased the enemies out of his territory. Vidyāpati says that the people went so jubilant over this victory that they almost forgot the tragedy in the death of Devasiṃha[1]. At one place the poet calls Śivasiṃha "*Pañca-Gauḍeśvara*", *i.e*, "the Lord of the five Gauḍas". According to some scholars[2] the fact that Mithilā was always closely allied to Bengal and was subject to it at the time of the introduction of the L. S. era accounts for our poet's solution to the "Pañca-Gauḍeśvara", the princes of Mithilā being regarded as princes of Gauḍa or Bengal. This view sounds paradoxical, for Mithilā's subjection to

1. "एक दिस यवन सकल बल चलिओ एक दिस सौ यमरा अनरू, दुहु ओ दलटि मनोरथ पुरयो गरूअ दाप शिवसिंह करू" (Vidyāpati's account). From this account it is clear that Mithilā was invaded by the Muslims during the life-time of Devasiṃha. Tradition asserts that Sivasiṃha fought the inroaders bravely but was defeated and imprisoned. The kingdom was restored to Devasiṃha only when he submitted to the terms dictated by the victor. We are told that the Emperor of Delhi carried off Sivasiṃha to his capital to punish him for the offence of revolting against the forces of the Emperor. Vidyāpati hastened to Delhi. appeared before the Emperor and declared his ability to see things hidden from him, as if they were before his eyes. Having performed miracles he pleased him so much that the Emperor ordered Sivasiṃha's release immediately and gave the poet the village of Bisapi which was later on given to the poet by Sivasiṃha himself. It appears that this tradition has been evidently confused with that of the invasion of Mithilā by the Muslim conqueror in which Sivasiṃha was defeated. This record, to a great extent, finds corroboration in the chronicles of the contemporary Muhammadan historian
2. IA. IV. 301.

Gauḍa or Bengal could in no case have entitled the princes of Mithilā to be also called the princes of Gauḍa. As a matter of fact, the case should have been just the reverse. It is, however, impossible to imagine that under the Muhammadan rule any Hindu king could conquer the whole of Bengal. Hence the epithet should not be taken literally, but only as signifying the power and excellence of the king over other things[1].

As regards his conquest over the kings of Gauḍa, it may be said that like Mithilā, Bengal was also passing through a period of political unstability. The murder of Ghiyāsuddin and the accession of Saifuddin Hamzā Shāh (1409-10) resulted in violent civil war[2]. Rājā Gaṇeśa took advantage of the situation and usurped the throne. After him, his eldest son (who became a Muslim) Jalāluddin (Jadusena) became the king. He was a contemporary of Śivasiṃha. He led an expedition against Gauḍa with a view to extending his sway over that part. Śivasiṃha thought of conquering this newly converted Muslim king. He is said to have defeated Jalāluddin[3] and annexed some portion of his kingdom[4].

The deed of endowment known as the Copperplate Grant of Śivasiṃha to Vidyāpati dated La. Saṃ. 293, Sana 807, Saṃvat 1445, Śāke 1329, yet exists and records "the victorious feet of king Śivasiṃha, illumined with all prerogatives, who has obtained favour by a boon at the hands

1. Ibid. XIV. 189.
2. HB. II. 119, 127-28.
3. Vidyālaṅkāra & Mehta, Bihar, pp. 212-13; Vidyālaṅkāra, Itihāsa-Praveśa, 332.
4. P. Jhā, Op. Cit. 156; JBRS. XL. 115 ff; also cf. Mitra-Majumdar, Vidyāpati, 37.

of Rāmeśvara who is intent on encouraging the faith of Bhavānī, Rūpanārāyaṇa order and command all inhabitants and cultivators of Bisapī in Paraganā Jaraila as follows—Be it known to you that this village is given by us to the great Paṇḍita Śrī Vidyāpati Thakkura, glorious as a new Jayadeva. According to his commands, must ye cultivate. Thursday, 7th of the light half of Śrāvaṇa L. S. 293 (A.D. 1412)".[1] The Copperplate is all praise for its patron, king Śivasiṃha. The only point of interest is the date recorded in the grant. The genuineness of the plate cannot be doubted, as the deed is said to have been in the possession of the poet's descendants till the advent of the Britishers in India. That Śivasiṃha reigned jointly with his father is also proved by the fact that Vidyāpati's verse dates the death of Devasiṃha in La Saṃ 293, *i. e.*, March 23rd 1412 or 1413 A.D.[2]

1. "अब्दे लक्ष्मणसेन भूपतिमिते वह्निग्रहद्वयङ्किते
मासि श्रावणसंज्ञके मुनितिथौ पक्षेऽवलक्षे गुरौ
वाग्वत्याः सरितस्तटे गजरथेत्याख्या प्रसिद्ध पुरे
दित्नोत्साह समृद्धबाहु पुलकस्सभ्याय मध्येसभम्
प्रज्ञावान् प्रचुरोर्व्वरं पृथुतराभोगन्नदीमातृकं
सारण्यं ससरोवरञ्च विसपीनामानमासीमतः
श्री विद्यापतिशर्मणे सुकवये वाणीरसस्वादवि-
द्वीर श्रीशिवसिंहदेवनृपतिर्ग्रामं ददे शासनम्"

cf. S. N. Thakur, Mahākavi Vidyāpati. pp. 8-9; IA. XIV. 190-91. Grierson takes La Saṃ. 293 to be 1403 A. D. but it should be 1412 A. D. taking La. Saṃ, to commence 1119 A. D.

For different interpretations of this date cf. IA. IV. 301; IA. XIV. 191; Proc. ASB. 1895, pl. iii; IA. XVIII. 30-31; Cunningham, Indian Eras, 77 ff.

2. JASB. 1915 (N. S.), p. 422.

The most knotty point contained in the record is (Faslī) San 807 which has defied any satisfactory solution so far. We know that no such era existed at the time, as the Faslī San was founded a century and half later in Akbar's time. The mention of Saṃvat year is also suspicious as that era was not used in any part of Eastern India[1]. The authentic date about Śivasiṃha is La. Saṃ. 291 when he was ruling Tīrabhukti and when a MS. of Śrīdhara's *Kāvya-prakāśa-viveka* was copied by order of Vidyāpati[2]. The date comes to 1410 A. D.[3]. But the date La. Saṃ. 293 also seems authentic as L.S. 291. Keilhorn believes that this day, *i.e.*, the 10th July, 1399 would fall in the Bengalī San 806 and the Hijri San 801 (not 807). Unless, therefore, there has been an error in the calculation of the writer of this deed neither of the two latter eras can be meant by the word "San"[4]. We have another era, also entitled, "San"— the Faslī San, introduced by Akbar, which in modern days is generally current in Mithilā[5]. The year runs exactly parallel with the V. S. The only difference is that to obtain the Faslī

1. Ibid. 421-22.
2. Ind. Govt. MSS., folio 117 A : "इति तर्क्काचार्य ठक्कुर श्री श्रीधर-विरचिते काव्य प्रकाशविवेक (के) दशम उल्लास: । शुभमस्तु समस्तविरुदावली, महाराजाधिराज श्रीमत शिवसिंहदेवसंभुज्यमानतीरभुक्तौ श्रीगजरथपुरनगरे सप्रक्रियै सदुपाध्याय ठाकुर श्रीविद्यापति नामाज्ञा खोयालसंश्रीदेवशर्म बलिया-ससंश्रोप्रभाकराभ्यां लिखितैषा हस्ताभ्यां (।) लसं २९१ कातिक वदी १० ॥
3. According to M. M. Chakravarti 7th March, 1399 A D. (JASB, 1915, pp. 421-22) and according to Keihorn 10th July 1399 (IA. XVIII. 31).
4. JASB. LXVIII. 96
5. Prinsep's Useful Tables (Ed. Thomas), p. 170.

year we must subtract 648 from the Saṃvat date. Moreover, there are no dark and light fortnights in the Faslī month. The days run through each month from 1 to 30. With this exception the Faslī day of the month and week day are always the same as the Saṃvat ones. Thus, it will be seen that Faslī San does as a matter of fact correspond to V.S. 1455. Grierson has, therefore, rightly observed that this stamps a very clumsy forgery, for F. S. 807 never existed. The first year of the era as followed by Akbar was not I but 963. No date purporting to be earlier than F. S. 963 is possible[1].

In the Padāvali[2] we come across the names of Tripurasiṃha, his son Arjuna Rāya, the husband of Kamalādevī, and also another prince Amarasiṃha, husband of Jñānadevī. Tradition avers that Tripurasiṃha was brother of Śivasiṃha and father of Amarasiṃha. Vidyāpati's Lakhanāvali states that Arjuna was killed by Purāditya, the patron of Vidyāpati[3]. According to Monmohan Chakravarti, this event occurred on or before La. Saṃ. 299 (1417-8 A.D.) —a date mentioned several times in the sample form of letters given in that work[4]. In the Padāvali we have the

1. JASB. LXVIII. 96.
2. Nos. 99, 300, 721, 723 & 725.
3. pp. 2-3 :

"संग्रामेऽर्ज्जुनभूपतिर्व्विनिहतो बंधौनृशंसायित:
स्तेनेयं लिखनावली नृपपुरादित्येन निर्म्मापिता"

4. JASB. 1915 (N. S.) p. 422. It is said, after the defeat of Sivasiṃha, his family-members under the care of Vidyāpati shifted to a village, Rāja-Banaulī in Nepal where Sivasiṃha's friend " Arjuna-vijayī " was ruling. Thus from Likhanavali it is evident that Purāditya had carved out an independent king-

name of one Rāya Dāmodara. He was probably one of the courtiers of Śivasiṃha. That apart, we have also the names of some Muhammadans ; *viz.*, Gyāsadeva Suratrāṇa (probably Sultan Ghiyas-ud-Din Azam who ruled Bengal between 1390 and 1412 A. D.), Malik Baharadin and Ālam Shah. But the verses about the Bengal Sultans—Rāya Nasarat Shah and Shah Husein[1] are certainly spurious, for they ruled a century later.

dom or a Janapada in Saptarī after having slain his enemy, Arjuna. He is called Droṇavāra Mahīpati who defeated all his enemies. This was probably the outcome of a civil war for the throne between the two branches of Kāmeśvara dynasty Arjuna was the son of Tripurasiṃha who is also associated with the murder of Gaṇeśvara. Arjuna is mentioned in the Rāmabhadrapura MS. (S. N. Thakur, Vidyāpati ka Viśuddha Padāvali, Nos. 79 & 86) and one Amara is mentioned in the Padāvali (Ibid, No. 410 ; N. G. No. 723). Arjuna and Amara were sons of Tripurasiṃha. Aśoka pillar at Lauriya Nandanagarh contains an inscription dated V. S. 1556 (1499 or 1500 A. D.) which reads : "नृपन्नारायण सुत अमरसिंह" (Singh, 83) These two brothers were probably local chieftains and were defeated by Purāditya who carved out an independant kingdom for himself. The expression 'बन्धौ नृशंसायितः" indicates the intemperate and cruel behaviour of Arjuna against his kinsmen. He was ultimately killed. The substitution of the term 'बन्धौ" by "बौद्धौः" (Sen, Vidyāpati Goṣṭhī, p. 18) showing that Arjuna instigated his Buddhist subjects to disturb the Yajña performed by Vidyāpati after his flight to Purāditya in Saptarī lacks support in the contemporary literature. (cf. Mishra, Vidyāpati Thakura, 56-57, 43 ; JBRS. XL. 118-20 ; JASB. LXXII, pt. i. p. 27 ; Mitra-Majumdar, 17, fn. 46 ; JL. 1927. p. 27 ; JBORS. xxviii. 421.

1. Nos. 268, 34, 44, respectively.

It seems that evil days befell Śivasiṃha, when he had been on the throne only three years and nine months (c. 1410-1414 A. D.). Śiva felt humiliation in paying tribute to the Sultan. A man of independent disposition he soon wanted to break away from the Delhi-yoke. As a first step in this direction he revolted and stopped paying the tribute due to the Sultan. He no doubt succeeded in establishing his independence for a while but this triumph proved short-lived.

The Sultan got enraged and found in the new situation a splendid opportunity to feed his old grudge. The trumpet was blown out and the Muslim forces were ordered to march. A showdown was now imminent. The situation proved too critical for Śivasiṃha to face. And, the inevitable happened. Defeated and humiliated he was carried off to Delhi[1]. This episode took place in c 1414 or 1416 A. D. Some scholars believe that he was killed in the battle, while others hold that he fled away into the forests of Nepal and was heard no more[2]. It seems that after the capture of Śivasiṃha Lakhimā Devī and Vidyāpati took refuge with Rājā Purāditya of Saptari in Nepal. Local scholars believe that Śivasiṃha fled away to Nepal as the yet extant ruins of Śivarājagarh (named after him on the India-Nepal-border) tend to indicate. It is also probable that Lakhimā Devī founded the garh in commemoration of her beloved husband. Whatever the consequences, the fact remains that Śivasiṃha was defeated and crushed and Mithilā once more passed under the direct domination of the Muslims. Vidyāpati, who is said to have been

1. IA. 1899, pp. 57-58.
2. Mishra, Vidyāpati Thākura, 28.

present in the battle-field has given a scintillating and graphic description of the various weapons used on the occasion. From the nature of his description it appears that the battle was horribly sanguinary resulting in the conversion of the battle-field into the gigantic heaps of heads of soldiers, horses, elephants, etc.[1]. Śivasiṃha stubbornly resisted, but the fickle fate finally deserted him. His sudden collapse marked the end of a glorious era. The kingdom of Gajarathapura assumed a sad spectable of desertion and gloom. And, with him parted all the pomp and grandeur of the land.

Śivasiṃha was an extremely celebrated king of the line. His memory is still preserved among the people who point to the large tank, said to have been dug by him at the village Rajokharī, and quote the proverb—" the tank at Rajokharī is indeed a tank ; all others are mere ponds (puddles) ; king Śivasiṃha was indeed a king, all others were mere princelets"[2]. He was a great warrior. "The battle-field was soaked with tens of millions of rivers of the blood of the armies of kings who were his enemies."[3] "Honoured amidst the race of kings" and "skilled in the

1. "मेरु कनक सुमेरु रम्पिय धरणि पूरिय गगन झम्पिय
हाति तुरय पदाति पयभर रमन सहि ओरे
नग्ल तर तरवारि रंगे विज्जुदाम छटा तरंगे
घोरघन संघात वारिस काल दरस ओरे
पारभइ परिपन्थि गज्जिअ भूमि मण्डल मण्डे मण्डिअ
चारु चन्द्र कलेव कीत्ति सुकेतकी तुलि ओरे" (Quoted, P. Jha, op. cit. 168).

2. IA. XIV. 187 : "पोखरि रजोखरि और सब पोखरा, राजा शिवसिंह और सभ छोकरा"

3. Ibid. 190-91 ; "····कोटिभि: प्रतापतरुवृद्धये समर–मेदिनी प्लाविता··"

service of archery " he had gained " universal glory." A great giver of gifts he " gave out of his own wealth, a wondrous gift equal to his (father's) weight in gold."[1] From the Padāvali we learn that he had six wives. Lakhimā or Lachimā is most frequently mentioned among them. She is named with the king in at least one hundred songs, which undoubtedly shows that she was the chief or favourite queen[2].

Acyuta, grandfather of Ravi, who wrote " *Madhumati* " —a Commentary on " *Kāvya-Prakāśa* " was a mantrī (minister) of Śivasiṃha. There are also references to other ministers—Maheśa or Maheśvari, husband of Reṇukādevī and Ratidhara, husband of Rupinīdevī. In Padāvali one Śaṃkara is also named with his wife Jayamati. He was probably a high official to be thus prominently mentioned[3].

Śivasiṃha was probably the first Maithila king to have issued gold coins in his name, of which two specimens were discerned from Camparan district in 1913. They bear on the obverse '*śrī*", and on the reverse (*i*) *śiva- ii*)-*sya*. In R. D. Banerji's opinion these are the issues of Śivasiṃha of Mithilā. But the extensive find-spot and the nature of

1. Ibid.
2. JASB. 1915, p. 420. His other queens were : (2) Sukhamādevī, (3) Madhumati, (4) Suramādevī, (5) Rupinīdevī, (6) Medhā devī and (7) Modavatīdevī. The last one may be a variant of No. 3 or No. 6 while the second and the fourth may be the same. (cf. Padāvali, Nos 60, 127, 186, 309, 467, 523, 678 etc. See also pada No. 25 -Sivanandana Thākura's MS ; JBORS. XXVII. 424 ; Eggeling, I. O. Cat. IV. 874-76 ; IA. XIV. 196).
3. JASB. 1915, p. 412. For other officers cf. Padāvali, Nos. 76 333, 357 etc.

the coins, however, raise reasonable doubts as to its genuineness[1].

Śivasiṃha's chief claim to fame rests on his patronage of learning. Not only was his wife Lakhimā one of the few learned women of India, but his court was frequented by poets and scholars, *e.g.*, Vidyāpati ; Vācaspati Miśra, the author of "*Tattva-kaumudī*", "*Vivāda Candra*" and other works of immortal fame. Of them Vidyāpati was at once the most famous and the most faithful. In this respect Śivasiṃha was true to the traditions of his family, as like the Senas who are said to have devoted their effort to "collecting troops of poems rather than to marshalling armies of soldiers", the Brāhmaṇa kings were noted for their encouragement of learning and the fine arts, and desiring to emulate the fame of Vikramāditya, Lakṣmaṇasena and Bhoja Rāja "showed no niggard hand in encouraging pre-eminence in the knowledge of Sāstras" Their courts were said to be the Sanskrit *belles lettres* and philosophy. About this time many works, celebrated to the present day, were composed. They also gradually began to turn their attention to Maithilī, and in a short time poems in that language began to be composed, which found its champion in Vidyāpati. They literally lived "immersed in the study of sacred books and poems."[2]

Lakhimā Devī

Lakhimā the chief queen of Śivasiṃha, ascended the throne after the tragic end of her husband (c. 1416 A. D.)

1. Arch. Surv. Ind. Ann. Rep. 1913-14, pp. 548-49, pl. LXVII, fig. 13.
2. IA. XIV. 182 ff, XVIII. 57 ; MDG. 119-21.

Grierson places her after Padmasiṃha[1]. He, however, contradicts his own statement when he says that when no news of Śivasiṃha had been received from Delhi for 12 years, Lakhimā became "satī" and Padmasiṃha, Śivasiṃha's younger brother, came to the throne but only reigned for a year. Local traditions assert that Lakhimā ruled for a period of 12 years (c. 1416-1428/9 A. D.)[2].

Beames makes one Rānī Padmāvatī Devī, the immediate successor of Śivasiṃha[3]. Evidently he has confused Lakhimā Devī with one Padmāvatī who is no where mentioned as the first wife of Śivasiṃha. Eggeling has rightly stated that Lakhimā Devī succeeded Śivasiṃha[4]. Tradition is conspicuously silent on this point. Even Vidyāpati has nothing to say about her accession. The fact, however, remains that Lakṣimā or Lakhimā, with some of her courtiers including Vidyāpati took shelter in the palace of king

1. An Introduction to Maithilī Language, pt. ii, p. 40.
2. IA. XXVIII. 57-58. Another tradition goes that one Amṛtakara, the Minister of Sivasiṃha and son of Kāyastha Candrakara went over to Patna after the tragic fall of his master and begged the kingdom of the Sultan's representative there. He then crowned Padmasiṃha at a new capital at Padumā (a village in paraganā Bacchaurā, Darbhanga) and deserted Gajarathapura for good (Mishra, Vidyāpati Thākura, 28-29). We have no evidence to support Amṛtakara's adventure to Patna. Moreover, it rules out Lakhimā's accession to the throne immediately after Sivasiṃha. This goes against established historical traditions corroborated by several evidences. It may however, be possible that Padmasiṃha after his coronation changed the seat of the government and named the new capital after his own name.
3. IA. IV. 301.
4. I. O. Cat. IV. No. 2564.

Purāditya alias Girinārāyaṇa[1] and probably returned immediately after receiving "Sanad" from the Sultan on the initiative of Vidyāpati.

We have no record of her activities excepting that she was a celebrated lady with scholastic talents. An euridite scholar, she was also a poetess of the first order. Her verses in Sanskrit, of which stray pieces are yet extant, are greatly honoured by the scholars of Mithilā. Numerous legends speaking eloquently of her poetic talent and unsurpassing wit and humour are yet a matter of keen interest in Maithila families[2]. The sircastic way she has described the *Bikauās* and the condemnatory language that she has used while deprecating those who sold their sisters under the garb of marriage, in her Sanskrit verses is a crystal reflection of her progressive bend of mind[3]. Along with her husband she was also the patron of Vidyāpati who stood by her to the last. It is not known if ever she wrote in Maithilī as we have no specimen of her writing in that language. It is said, overridden with grief on the sad end of her husband she became a *satī*. Though dead some six hundred years ago, she is yet the most familiar name in the Maithila families through Vidyāpati's immortal songs.

1. Mitra-Majumdar, Vidyāpati, 38.
2. IA. XIV. 318-19
3. In Mithilā, men of certain high sept of Brāhmaṇas were in the habit of selling their daughters and sisters in marriage to Brāhmaṇas of lower castes, and of marrying girls of the so-called lower caste to those of higher sept on receipt of a consideration. This sept was called from its practices the sept of **Bikaua** or mercenary Brāhmaṇas. This system has now practically died out.

cf. Mishra, Vidyāpati Thākura, 23-25; for specimens of Lakhimā's Sanskrit verses, see IA. XV. 19 ff.

Padmasiṃha

Padmasiṃha, younger brother of Śivasiṃha, ascended the throne in c. 1430 A. D. R. L. Mitra wrongly takes him to be the son of Śivasiṃha[1]. It appears that he had a very short reign without any achievement worth recording. Even Vidyāpati, the only poet-chronicler of the time, has nothing to say about his activities as a king. His reign-period, like that of Lakhimā, passed through one of the most critical periods in the history of the land, and he was just a shadowy figure acting by the directives by or will of his Muslim masters who had ruthlessly crushed the people and their morale.

Padmasiṃha, as Vidyāpati[2] says, was a brave king like Bhīma, the matchless legendary Pāṇḍava hero, and a great giver of gifts who "dominated one and all by the wonderful traits of character and personal qualities and alike his predecessors he too was a great patron of learning and culture"[3]. But, these eulogies are just on the conventional line quite in keeping with the Medieval spirit from which Vidyāpati also was not immune.

Padmasiṃha died childless (c. 1430/31 A. D.). He was followed by his wife Viśvāsa Devī on the throne.

1. Notices, VI. No. 1983. Vidyāpati clearly states in his Saiva-sarvasva-sāra (Intro, verses 6-8) that Padmasiṃha was Sivasiṃha's **anuja**, younger brother.
2. Vidyāpati has mentioned him in one of his poems (Vide—Mitra-Majumdar, Vidyāpati, No. 208 : " नृपति पदुम सिंह जाने "; S. N. Thakur, No. 25).
3. Saiva-sarvasva-sāra (Intro. verses 6-8) : " संग्रामाङ्गनसीम भीम सदृश····दाने स्वल्पित कल्पवृक्ष····"

Viśvāsa Devī

As regards the accession of Viśvāsa Devī on the throne of Mithilā, scholars are unanimous[1]. She is said to have ruled for about 12 years, which the date (1375 śāke or 1453 A.D. of the Kandahā Inscription (Bhagalpur district) of Narasiṃhadeva, who ruled after Harasiṃhadeva, the successor of Viśvāsa Devī, also seems to suggest. Vidyāpati has showered praises on her in his *Śaiva-sarvasva-sāra*. From the description it is evident that nothing worth recording occurred during her reign save her patronage of some of the most illumined literary gems of the period.

Viśvāsa Devī was yet another celebrated lady of the time. She is credited with having founded the village of Bisaulī after her name and made it her capital[2]. She was the most beloved queen of Padmasiṃha. Under her kind patronage Vidyāpati wrote *Śaiva-sarvasva-sāra*, *Pramāṇa-bhūta-purāṇa saṃgraha*, and *Gaṅgā-vākyāvali*. These books are replete with the eulogies of the queen. But like Lakhimā, she does not appear to have been a great poet or scholar. Notwithstanding, her patronage of Sanskrit learning is unique and second to none.

She died childless and the elder branch virtually disappeared with her death.

1. Grierson, An Introduction to Maithilī Language, pt. ii, p. 40 ; IA. XVIII. 57-58 ; Eggeling, I O. Cat. IV. No. 2564 ; IV 301 ; Mishra, Vidyāpati Thākura, 29.

2. Ibid. 29.

Harasiṃhadeva

With the disappearance of the elder branch Harasiṃha (wrongly identified by some scholars with the Karṇāṭa Harisiṃha[1]) the younger son of Bhavasiṃha and the younger brother of Devasiṃha ascended the throne of Mithilā. The meagre information that we have about this monarch from the contemporary literature distinctly points to the utter insignificance of his rule. It seems that his reign-period was too brief to witness any remarkable events.

We have his name appearing in Vidyāpati's *Vibhāga-sāra*, Vācaspati Miśra's (II) *Kṛtya mahārṇava* and *Mahā-dāna-nirṇaya*, Misaru Miśra's *Vivāda-candra* and Vardha-māna's *Gaṅgā-kṛtya-viveka*. It is a matter of great surprise that though his name finds mention in so many books by

1. The identification of Harasiṃha with Harisiṃha of the Karṇāṭa line is misleading, as the latter was a Kṣatriya Sūryavaṃśī while the former was a Srotriya rājā who appeared on the political scene well over a century later (cf. Mitra, Notices, I, p xiv ; Kandahā Inscription in JBORS. xx. p. 17, lines 1-2).

   Some scholars believe that Harasiṃha was the immediate successor of Sivasiṃha. P. Jhā, on the basis of the story entitled " Gīta-vidyā-kathā " in Puruṣa-parīkṣā (Ed. Grierson p. 171) has identified this king with Harasiṃha mentioned in the Puruṣa-parīkṣā (Op. Cit. 170-71). This is untenable as (i) the Gorakhpur king Udayasiṃha can not be a contemporary of this king, (ii) Kalānidhi in his remark has used the past and (iii) Puruṣa-parīkṣā was written during the time of Sivasiṃha and it can not relate a story of incident that took place after his reign. (cf. JBRS, XL, 120-21).

the celebrated authors of the time nothing significant is recorded about him. The negligence shown by the contemporary writers amply illustrates his uneventful reign-period. The Kandahā Inscription of Narasiṃhadeva also refers to him as only 'a thinker" (in sacerdotal ceremonies) in respect of all the rites and "a brave man ".[1] He must have been pretty old at the time of his coronation and as such ruled for a short time.

Narasiṃhadeva

Narasiṃha or Nṛsiṃha (wrongly identified by some soholars with the Karṇāṭa Narasiṃhadeva)[2] immediately followed his father Harasiṃha. He had the viruda "*Darpa-nārāyaṇa*". In his case also we have nothing but the glorifying eulogies in the works of the contemporary writers.[3] Like his predecessors Narasiṃha's reign-period was shorn of any major political events, though the Kandahā Inscription dated 1375 Śaka *ie*, c. 1453 A.D.[4]

1. JBORS. XX. 17 : "पृथ्वीपति-द्विजवरो भव (सिंह आ) सीदाशं विषेन्द्र-वगुरुज्ज्वल कीर्त्तिराशि: । तस्यात्मज: सकल-कृत्य-विचार-धीरो वीरो (ब)भूव वि (-ह-)र सिंहदेव (: ॥).
2. It is wrong to confuse his name with the Karṇāṭa Narasiṃhadeva. The Kandahā inscription has decidedly settled the issue finally (Ibid. line 4).
3. Vidyāpati's Dāna-vākyāvali and Durgā-bhakti-taraṅgiṇi ; Vācaspati's Kṛtya-mahārṇava and Vyavahāra-cintāmaṇi ; Misaru Miśra's Vivādacandra ; Rucipati's Anargha-rāghava-ṭīkā and Vardhamāna's Gaṅgā-kṛtya-viveka.
4. According to Dr. Subhadra Jha, the date of this inscription should be 1375 Sāke and not 1357 Sāke as interpreted by Jayaswal. The argument that Jayaswal has advanced is undoubtedly wrong and unwarranted (cf. Jha, The Songs of Vidyāpati, 44-46).

describes the donor, i.e., Narasiṃha as "he, the rays of the nails of whose petal-like feet, were increased in lustre by the rays of the precious stones on the diadems of unfriendly rulers conquered by his two pillar-like arms."[1] He is also represented as having protected "the province according to the system declared by Maya."[2] In other words, he was a warrior and follower of the political theory of Maya who is cited in Kāmandaka[3] but whose work has not yet been recovered. He was "the fore-head mark of the kings" (*bhūpatilakaḥ*) and the 'handsome one".[4] Inspite of all these eulogies we can, however, safely conclude that no remarkable event occurred during his time excepting that he took keen interest in administrative and judicial affairs as it was by his order that Vidyāpati wrote *Vibhāga-sāra*,[5] a treatise dealing with judicial matters that ultimately became the guiding code of his administration. Vidyāpati says in his *Durgā-bhakti taraṅgiṇi* that he was a great warrior, a great giver of gift and an euridite scholar. Under his patronage Mm. Sudhākara wrote Ratnāvali, a treatise dealing with astronomy, and several other works on grammar, and logic.

1. JBORS. XX. 17, lines 3-4 : "पाद-पल्लव-नख-श्रेणी-मयुखावलि: । दाता तत्तनयो मयोक्तविधिनाभूमण्डलं पालयत् धीरः श्रीनरसिंह-भूप-तिलकः कान्तोधुना राजते"

   For the calculation of the date of the inscription, cf. Ibid. pp 18-19.
2. Ibid line 5.
3. VIII. 20.
4. Line 5.
5. Mitra, Notices, IV. No. 2037.

He had two wives—Dhīramati, a celebrated lady of the day by whose order Vidyāpati wrote the *Dāna-vākyāvali*, and Hīrā mother of Candrasiṃha mentioned in Misarū Miśra's *Vivāda-candra.*

Narasiṃhadeva probably died in c. 1460-62 A.D.,[1] some five years after the inscription was engraved on the two vertical bars of the stone-frame of the door of the Bhavāditya temple in the village Kandahā in Bhagalpur district, referred to above.

Dhīrasiṃha

Narasiṃha left behind at least four sons, Dhīrasiṃha alias Hṛdayanārāyaṇa and Bhairavasiṃha alias Rūpanārāyaṇa by his first wife Dhīramati; and Candrasiṃha and Durlabhasiṃha alias Raṇasiṃha by his second wife Hīrādevī. Dhīrasiṃha, the eldest of all, succeeded on the throne. Like his father, he had also the viruda, Hṛdayanārāyaṇa.[2] Like his father his name also finds mention in several contemporary works of celebrated writers. The *Durgā-bhakti-taraṅgiṇī* was compiled by order of Dhīrasiṃha, which praises both him and his younger brothers Bhairavendra and Candrasiṃha. Prince Gadādhara was the son of Dhīrasiṃha.[3]

1. According to Mitra-Majumdar he ruled 1440-1453 A. D., together with his son Dhīrasiṃha (Vidyāpati, p. 40).
2. M. M. Chakravarti wrongly stated that the king's viruda was Kaṃsanārāyaṇa. रिपुराज कंसनारायण is only a description rendered by Lakṣmīnātha as संग्रामे रिपुराज–कंस-दलन-प्रत्यक्ष नारायण: His second name was Hṛdayanārāyaṇa (cf. JBORS. XX. 18, fn. 2 ; JASB. XI. 426, n. ; IA. 1885, p. 196 ; 1899, p. 58 ; JBORS. X. 47).
3. JASB. 1915 (N. S.), p. 424.

We have no definite date of this king. On Saturday new Moon of the month Kārttika in L. S. 321, a Ms. of Śrīnivāsa's *Setu-darpaṇī*, a Commentary on the *Setu-bandha*, was copied while Dhīrasiṃha was ruling Tīrabhukti (final colophon).[1] This date, according to Monmohan Chakravarti, comes to 1438 A. D.[2] This, however, should be 1440 A. D., according to the ancient reckoning. The difference between the ancient and the current reckoning being that of 11 years, L. S. 321 in either case would be either 1429 A. D. or 1440 A. D.[3] But this date (1440 A. D.) like the one (L. S. 327 or 1446 A. D.) recorded in the colophon of the Ms. of the *Karṇa-parvan* of the Mahābhārat copied during his reign[4] does not seem convincing, for in that case hardly two to four years of reign-period can be attributed to Dhīrasiṃha's predecessors which is impossible. The probability is that during the life-time of Narasiṃhadeva these works were prepared, of course, by the order of Dhīrasiṃha, the heir-apparent, as was the usual practice with the kings in those days. Dhīrasiṃha must have ascended the throne in c. 1460 A. D.

On the same conventional line Dhīrasiṃha is also described as "a great warrior, an invincible victor and

1. The MS. was discovered by Mm. Haraprasad Sāstrī (JASB. XI. 426. n) ; also cf. another MS. published by Jayaswal in JBORS. X. 47.
2. JASB. 1915 (N. S.), p. 426.
3. JBORS. XX. 18-19.
4. Ibid X. 47. This work was probably prepared during the life-time of his father Narasiṃhadeva who was also a Darpa-nārāyaṇa. Jayaswal has evidently confused the one with the other because of the sameness of their viruda.

a matchless giver of gifts" by Vidyāpati in his *Durgā-bhakti-taranginī*. He was a "world-famous" conqueror who conquered "several enemies and gained an undying glory in all the three worlds". Moreover, he was "a fountain of fame (*maryādā*) action (*prakāma*) and knowledge (*prajñā*)". The poet's reference to terms like "world-conqueror", "several enemies" etc. are simply absurd keeping in view the subordinate position that these kings held under the Delhi-Sultanate. He, however, maintained the traditional patronage of giving gifts (like golden bracelets) and learning and art[1]. Vidyāpati, Madhusūdana Miśra, Ratneśvara (son of Mm. Sudhākara), Mm. Ruci Miśra, Vaṭeśvara Mahāmahopādhyāya (author of *Mudrā-rākṣasa-nāṭaka-ṭīkā*), Mm. Narahari (Jhā, author of *Dvaita-nirṇaya*) and the Dharmādhikaraṇika (Chief Justice) Jagaddhara were some of the celebrities who illumined his court and enriched the Sanskrit literature by their immortal contributions.

In Vidyāpati's Padāvalī we have mention of one Rāghavasiṃha who had two wives, Modavatī and Soṇamatī[2]. This Rāghavasiṃha of the Padāvali is probably to be identified with Rāghavendra of the *Tantra-pradīpa*[3].

Bhairavasiṃha

Bhairavasiṃha was the younger brother and successor of Dhīrasiṃha who had a son named Rāghavendra or

1. JASB. 1915, p. 425. Madhusūdana Miśra's Jyotiḥ-pradīpa-aṅkura, end verse 1 (cf. Ind. Govt. Ms. No. 3004).
2. Nos. 700, 724 & 748.
3. JASB. 1915, p. 425.

Rāghavasiṃhadeva, who did not succeed his father. Bhairavendra had the viruda *Rūpanārāyaṇa* which probably shows that he was ruling jointly with Dhīrasiṃha at the time just as Śivasiṃha was ruling with his father Devasiṃha. Besides Rūpanārāyaṇa, he appears to have also assumed, probably when he became the ruler, the other viruda *Harinārāyaṇa*[1]. He is mentioned in various works, such as Rucipati's *Anargha-rāghava-ṭīkā*; Vācaspati Miśra's *Dvaita-nirṇaya* and *Kṛtya-mahārṇava* ; Vardhamāna's *Daṇḍa-viveka* and *Gaṅgā-kṛtya-viveka.* He is referred to either by name or his viruda "Harinārāyaṇa." He probably transferred his capital to a new place, *i.e.*, village Baruāra in the Bacchaurā Paraganā (Darbhanga)[2].

He had two wives—Jayadevī (or Jayātmā), mother of Rājādhirāja Puruṣottamadeva alias *Garuḍanārāyaṇa* and the other one (whose name we do not know) was the mother of Rāmabhadrasiṃha alias *Rūpanārāyaṇa.* It was by the order of Puruṣottamadeva's mother that Vācaspati Miśra wrote the celebrated "*Dvaita nirṇaya*" on the doubtful points of Smṛti[3].

Vidyāpati in his *Durgā-bhakti-taraṅgiṇī*[4] says that during the reign of Dhīrasiṃha Bhairava had by his valour subjugated the lord of Pañca-Gauḍa[5]. He also influenced one

1. Ind. Govt. MS. No. 4760, fol. Ia, Intro. verse 5 and the end verse no. 2.
2. cf. Candra Jha, Puruṣa-parīkṣā, (Darb. Ed.)—towards the end.
3. Mitra, Notices, I, No. 275, Intro. verses 5-7.
4. p. 1.
5. Ind. Govt. MS. 4760, fol. 1a, Intro. verse 5 and the end verse No. 2:

"शौर्य्यवर्जित पञ्चगौड़धरणीनाथोपनम्रीकृताऽनेकोत्तुङ्गतरङ्गसङ्गतसितच्छत्राभिरामोदयः
श्रीमद्भैरवसिंहदेवनृपतिर्यस्यानुजन्मा जयत्याचन्द्राकमखण्डकीर्त्तिसहितः श्रीरूपनारायणः"

Kedār Rāya, the representative (*pratiśarīram*) of the Lord of Gauḍa[1]. We have no evidence to support or corroborate this contention. But the general political condition of Northern India during the period does not preclude this possibility altogether. From Vācaspati's *Sodaśa mahādāna-nirṇaya-grantha* we learn that the condition of the Muslim Emperor of Delhi during the time was very critical. Internal strifes and plots and intrigues for seizing the throne had become the order of the day. Provincial governors were gradually declaring themselves independent of the Central authority. There was no stable central power to arrest this accelerating process of disintegration. This chaotic state of affairs might have encouraged Dhīrasiṃha to throw off the yoke of Muslim surveillance, and even attack the neighbouring provinces and conquer them. But, the coming events soon proved that this was just a passing phase.

Tradition attributes hundreds of tanks, towns *paṭṭanas* (hamlets and performance of the "*tulā puruṣa*" gift ceremony to him[2]. A keen student of politics he took great interest in administrative affairs. By his order Vācaspati wrote *Vivāda-cintāmaṇi* and *Vyavahāra-cintāmaṇi*—treatises dealing with administrative and judicial matters which soon became the guiding code of the land. Tradition goes that he had also negotiated friendly relations with the king of Ceylon, and messengers were frequently

1. Ibid ; Also cf Daṇḍa-viveka, intro. verse 4 (As Soc. MS. p. 1): "गौड़ेश्वरप्रतिशरारमतिप्रताप: केदाररायमवगच्छति दारतुल्यं"
2. cf. Mahadāna-nirṇaya, intro. verse 7 (Nepal Notices, p. 112, written in L. S. 392 or 1511 A. D.).

exchanged between the two countries[1]. But, the statement lacks support in other sources.

Bhairavendra had a younger brother—Candrasiṃha whom both Vidyāpati and Misaru Miśra mention in their works. He was probably his step-brother, for Gadādhara in his *Tantra-pradīpa* mentions only two sons of Darpanārāyaṇa (Narasiṃhadeva), his own grandfather Dhīrasiṃha and Bhairavendra. Should Candrasiṃha be his uterine brother, he could not have omitted him. Candrasiṃha had a wife Lakhimā or Lachimā Devī by whose order Misaru Miśra wrote his two works—The *Vivāda-candra*[2] and The *Padārtha-candra*[3].

Bhairavendra's reign-period will go down in the history of Sanskrit literature as one of the most remarkable periods of unrivalled literary persuits and startling philosophical attainments. Under his patronage Rucipati wrote *Anargha-rāghava ṭīkā* ; "abhinava" Vācaspati Miśra (*Smārtta*), "the crest-jewel among scholars", compiled the *Vyavahāra-cintāmaṇi*, *Kṛtya-mahārṇava*, *Mahādāna-nirṇaya* (L. S. 392 *i. e.*, 1511 A. D.), *Dvaita-nirṇaya*, *Kṛtya-cintāmaṇi*, *Dvaita-cintāmaṇi* and a dozen other treatises ; the great Pakṣadhara Miśra wrote his immortal works—*Navyanyāyāloka*, *Tithicandrikā* & etc. and Vardhamāna Upādhyāya composed the *Daṇḍa-viveka*, and last but not the least the celebrated poet Vidyāpati wrote his *Durgā-bhakti-taraṅgiṇī*. Moreover, Vācaspati was his *pari-*

1. P. Jhā, Op Cit 191 ff
2. Skt. Coll. MS. II 1107, fol. 1a, intro. verses 4-5.
3. Mitra, Notices, IX. p. 12, No. 290.

ṣad or officer (courtier) and Vardhamāna his *Dharmādhi-karaṇika* or judge, as is evident from the colophons of *Śūdrācāra-cintāmaṇi* and the *Daṇḍa-viveka*[1].

He ruled for about 35 years and died in c. 1515 A. D.[2]

Rāmabhadradeva

The fourteenth king in the line was Rāmabhadradeva, the son and successor of Bhairavendra. Like his father and his ancestor Śivasiṃha, he had also the viruda "Rūpa-nārāyaṇa". In the works of Vācaspati, Gadādhara, the Āndhra (Telugu) Bhaṭṭa Śrīrāma and Saṅkara Miśra he has been referred to either by name or his viruda[3].

Rāmabhadra must be older than La. Saṃ. 376 Pauṣa vadi 13 Wednesday (13th January 1496 A.D.) when the copying of the *Gaṅgā-kṛtya-viveka* was completed[4]. The *Tantra-pradīpa* was written by Gadādhara while during the reign-period of Rāmabhadradeva, which shows that they

1. Final colophons, Mitra, Notices VI. p. 22 and colophons, As. Soc. MS. pp. 48, 59, 66, 80 & 108.
2. According to Mitra-Majumdar, (Vidyāpati, p 40) he ascended the throne in 1496 A. D., the date of Vardhamāna's "Gaṅgā-kṛtya-viveka."
3. cf. Vācaspati's Pitṛ-bhakti-taraṅgiṇī, (Ind. Govt. MS. 897, fol. 84a, the final colophon ; also see Vardhamāna's Gaṅgā-kṛtya-viveka, Br. Mus. Cat. pp. 75-76, intro. verses 2 & 4 and the final colophon. In Tattvāmṛta-sāroddhāra (Mitra, Notices VI, p. 57, No. 2030, end verse 4) the king is called Rāmapati. Bendall's identification of this Rāmabhadra with Rāmabhadra-siṃhadeva of the Karṇāṭa line (JASB, 1903, pt. i, p. 19) is absolutely misleading. (cf. JASB. 1915, N. S. p. 430).
4. Ibid. 429.

were contemporaries[1]. A MS. of Bhojadeva's *Vividha-vidyā-vicāra catura* was copied on Friday Śrāvaṇa Vadi 1 of La. Saṃ. 372 ; and a MS. of the *Dāna-kāṇḍa* of the *Kṛtya-kalpataru* was copied in Śaka 1426 and La. Saṃ. 374 Kārttika Śukla 5, Wednesday by the order of the same prince Gadādhara[2]. Gadādhara was, therefore, living in 1489–93 A. D., and, according to Monmohan Chakravarti, Rāmabhadra cannot be placed later than 1490 A. D.[3]. This date, however, does not seem convincing in view of the fact that in all these works of Gadādhara (1489–93 A. D.) Rāmabhadra has been clearly mentioned, which obviously shows that the latter must have been living at least during that time and even later. Tradition, supported by Grierson[4] and Eggeling[5], records that he was probably ruling during 1520–27 A. D. This, however, lacks support in contemporary literature and falls wide the mark as we have 1513 A. D. as the authentic date for Lakṣmīnātha, his successor.

Following in the foot-steps of his ancestors Rāmabhadra also transferred his capital to a new place Rāmabhadrapura (after his name) situated at a distance of about two miles east of the old kingdom, Śivasiṃhapura. He is said to have met Sikandar Lodi at Patna and exchanged friendly notes with him. This is clear from a verse contained in Mm. Vibhākara's *Dvaita-viveka*, written at the instance of king Rāmabhadra himself. From the

1. Mitra, Notices VI. p. 233, No. 2172, intro. verses 2-4.
2. Nepal Notices, 65 ; Ind. Govt. MS. 4026, fol. 131a.
3. JASB. 1915 (N. S.), p. 430.
4. An Introduction to Maithilī Language. pt. ii. p. 50.
5. I. O. Cat. IV. No. 2564.

same work we also learn that he conquered Gauḍa, Bengal or Māladaha, Murshidabad etc.[1]. But this eulogy is the conventional one, and merits no serious attention.

Likewise his father Rāmabhadra zealously patronised Sanskrit learning. The great Vācaspati Miśra, his pariṣad, wrote in his old age probably his last work on Smṛti, the *Pitṛ-bhakti taraṅgiṇī* ; Vardhamāna compiled the *Gaṅgā-Kṛtya-viveka* and other works and Vibhākara wrote *Dvaita-viveka.* Narahari Miśra, son of Vācaśpati Miśra also flourished during this time. Most interesting of all is the story of Bhaṭṭa Śrīrāma who went from Gayā to Tīrabhukti on pilgrimage—probably attracted by the fame of this Brāhmaṇa king. Having paid his visit to the king the pilgrim returned to Prayāga[2].

Mm. Dānapati writes in his *Śrāddha-darpaṇa* that during his time Mm. Vācaspati (Jhā), brother of Rucipati, abolished certain evil systems[3] effecting the vitality of the society. But unfortunately the author gives us no inkling of the reforms whatsoever.

Lakṣmīnātha Deva

Lakṣmīnātha was the last king with whom the dynasty ended. Tradion records him as the son and

1. "सिकन्दर पुरन्दरो गुरुदुरोदरक्रीड़या दिनं गमयति ध्रुवं विविधनागरीविभ्रमैः" and "जागर्त्य द्भुतविक्रमः स जगती कन्याकरग्राहको गौड़ोर्वीवलयेन्द्रदावदहनः श्रीरामभद्रोनृपः" (Quoted, P. Jhā, Op. Cit. 214).
2. He has recorded his visit at the chapter-ends of his famous Commentary on the Sārasvata Grammar (cf. the "Vidvat-prabodhinī," I. O. Cat. p. 214, No. 804).
3. P. Jhā, Op. Cit. 217-18.

successor of Rāmabhadradeva which is confirmed by his Bhagīrathapura Inscription, dated 394 L. S. *i.e*, 1513 A. D.[1] He had also a viruda " Kaṃsanārāyaṇa "[2].

The Bhagīrathapura Inscription is important in that it gives an authentic date *i.e.*, 394 L. S. or 1513 A.D. for Lakṣmīnātha Kaṃsanārāyaṇa which is quite consistent with other events of the period. A Maithila Ms. of the Devīmāhātmyam was also copied during his reign on Wednesday La. Saṃ. 392 of Pauṣa vadi 3 or December 1510 A. D.[3]. Thus the two dates supplement each other.

1. The inscription was discovered in a field in village, Bhagīrathapura, one mile north of Paṇḍaul Bazar, P. O. Davaith Nathwan via Pandaul, P. S. Madhubani, (Darbhanga) The excavation on the site was carried in November 1954, during which the inscription was found. The inscription is dated "वेद-रन्ध्र-हरनेत्र चिह्निते लक्ष्मणस्य नृपतेर्म्मतेब्दके" which may be interpreted as 304 L. S. (1423 A. D.) or L. S. 394 (1513 A. D.) as "रन्ध्र" stands for o (शून्य) and 9 (nine) both. According to the Pañjī records as well as the history of Mithilā the date 394 L. S. is more correct. For detailed information, cf. JBRS. XL 347 ff : The Indian Nation, Patna, (Dak Edition), Dated Thursday, Nov. 25, 1954, p. 6.
2. Ibid. verse 1, line 3 ; Mitra, Notices, VI. intro. verse 4 and the final colophon of Mantra-pradīpa ; JASB. 1915 (N. S.), p. 430.
3. Nepal Notices, p. 63, final colophon : "लसं० ३९२ पौष वदि ३ बुधे महाराज श्री कंसनारायणदेवे प्रचारेण····श्री उदयकरेण लिखितैषा प्रस्तीति" Also cf. the Mantra-pradīpa (Mitra, Notices VI, 34-35, intro. verse 4 and the final colophon).

The inscription describes him as a "great warrior king"[1], the "king of kings" (*rājārājādhirājaḥ*) and "a terror in Tirhut to the king of the Yavanas"[2]. The inscription gives no further information about him. Inspite of these conventional eulogies it, however, seems that unlike his ancestors Lakṣmīnātha was a man of weak personality and morality. Tradition current in Mithilā tends to show that he preferred luxury to the welfare of his people and patronage of learning. If Śrīdhara-episode handed down from generation to generation in Mithilā bore even a grain of truth, then we must assume that he was a great debauch[3]. This shows that moral degradation had graduaally set in. Meanwhile, the Muslim conquerers were once again battering at the gate. It was but natural that in a land predominantly inhabited by the orthodox Brāhmaṇas, moral turpitude on the part of the king should have kindled the fire of discontent among the people. The smouldering fire suddenly blazed up when Sultan Sikandar Lodi of Delhi marched towards Tirhut. Badaoni records that in the peace concluded at Barh between Alā-ud-din Husain Shah, king of Bengal and Sikandar Lodi, who after conquering Jaunpur had advanced against Husain Shah in 1499 A. D. or 1496 (H. 901), it was settled that Bihar and Tirhut

1. Verse 1, lines 3-4 : "द्विजोत्तमसुखप्रदा नृपतिकंसनारायणप्रवीर जननी मुदामठमचीकरसुन्दरम् "
2. Verse 6. lines 3-4 : "सूनुज्ज्यायान् यदीयो यवनपतिभयाधायकस्तीरभुक्तौ राजाराजाधिराज: समर—स: कंसनारायणोसौ"
3. This Srīdhara is said to have been his minister whose beautiful wife he wanted to entice away, but failed (P. Jhā, Op. Cit, 219-22).

and Sarkar Saran would be alloted to the latter on condition that he would not invade Bengal[1]. The treaty between the Emperor and the Bengal king was not observed long, for in the early part of the 16th century Nasrat Shah (1518-32) invaded Tirhut, put its Rājā (Lakṣmīnātha) to death and appointed his son-in-law Alā-ud-Din to be its governor (c. 1526 A. D.). This is also corroborated by a statement contained in a verse describing the death of Kaṃsanārāyaṇa dated Śaka 1449, *i.e.*, 1526 A. D.[2]. He then marched against Hajipur; subdued the tract and placed it in charge of his another son-in-law Makhdum Alam, who revolted against his brother-in-law Mahmud Shah in 1538 A. D. and joined Sher Khan who was at the time beginning the struggle which finally secured for him the throne of Delhi[3].

1. Badaoni, Vol. I. pp. 415-17 ; cf. Makhzan-i-Afghani (Trans. by Dorn), 1829, pt. i, p. 59 ; pt. ii, p. 96 ; Elliot. V. 96.
2. "अङ्काब्धिवेदशशि (१४४६) सम्मितशाकवर्षे, भाद्रे सिते प्रतिपदि क्षितिसूनुवारे हा हा निहत्य इव कंसनारायणोऽसौ, तत्याज देवसरसीनिकटे शरीरम् "

   (Quoted M. Jhā, Op. Cit. p. 544). According to Eggeling (I. O. Cat. No. 2524) he was ruling in 1532 A. D., while according to Grierson (Introduction to Maithilī Language, pt. ii, p. 96) in 1542 A. D. But these two dates are hardly convincing for we have it on record that Lakṣmīnātha was defeated and killed by Nasarat Shah (1518-32 A D.) who appointed his son-in-law as the governor of Tirhut. So, this incident must have taken place before 1532 A. D. i.e., in c. 1526 A. D. Also cf. Thomas, The Chronicles of Pathan Kings of Delhi, 391 ; JASB. 1915 (N. S.), p. 431.
3. For details cf. **Supra**, Chap. VIII.

The Later Oinavāras

The chaos and lawlessness that followed the death of Śivasiṃha probably gave rise to two new Brāhmaṇa dynasties—one in Gorakhpur and another in Campāran. They were the offshoots of the main Oinavāra line.

It is said that after Lakṣmīnātha, prince Indrasena, the author of *Śāli-hotra-sāra-saṃgraha*[1], belonged to this family. His viruda was Rūpanārāyaṇa. But it is not exactly known when he lived and what link he formed in the Kāmeśvara line. It is also not known if any local family replaced the ruling Kāmeśvara dynasty in Mithilā on its dismemberment.

It appears, however, that one Rājā Pṛthvīnārāyaṇasiṃhadeva reigned in Campāran in Saṃvat 1493 *i.e.* 1434-35 A. D.[2]. His successor was Śaktisiṃha who was followed by his son Madanasiṃha. Under his patronage two books dated 1453-54 A. D. and 1457 A. D. were written. In one of the books he has been referred to as *Vipra-rājā*

1. JASB. 1903, pt. i. p. 19. The final colophon of the "Sāli-hotra-sāra-saṃgrah" reads : "इति श्रीरूपनारायण · · · महाराजाधिराज श्री-इन्द्रसेनकृतौ सारसंग्रह: शान्तिहोत्र: समाप्त: । शुभम् । श्री शाके १७३४, श्रीसंवत् १८४१ आषाढ़ कृष्णपक्षस्य सप्तम्याम् भौमवासरे"

2. cf. Devīmahātmyam copied in the reign of Pṛthvīsiṃha in V. S. 1492 (1434-5 A. D.) at Campakāraṇya nagaram: "देवीमाहात्म्यम् नागराक्षरम् संवत् १४९२ समये भाद्र सुदि महाराज पृथ्वीसिंह-देवभुज्यमान राज्ये चम्पकारण्यनगरे । शुभमस्तु" (Sāstrī, Nepal Durbar Cat. p. 61, No. 1508. Singh, 82, fn. 1-2) ; Also cf. Mitra-Majumdar, Vidyāpati, p. 38.

(Brāhmaṇa king)[1]. He was probably the writer of *Madana-ratna-pradīpa*[2]. We have also coins of these kings, which bear "*govinda-caraṇa-praṇata*" on the obverse and "*śrīcampakāraṇya*" on the reverse. This shows that they were independent kings. It is, however, difficult to say to what family they belonged. That they were Brāhmaṇas and that they had "*siṃha*" as their epithet show that they were the offshoots of the Oinavāra line who carved out their independent principalities in those regions[3].

The Aśoka pillar at Lauriyā Nandanagarh in Campāran contains an inscription dated V. S. 1556 (1500 A. D.) which reads : '*Nṛpa-nārāyaṇa–suta Nṛpa Amarasiṃha.*" It is difficult to say how they were connected with the ruling families. It is safe to assume that they were local chieftains ruling in different parts after the collapse of the main line.

1. cf. Amara-koṣa (Bengali characters), p. 51 ; Sāstri, Catalogue. The colophon reads : " वि: संवत् १५११ श्रावण शुक्ल नवम्याम् शुक्रे श्रीचम्पकारण्यनगरे विप्रराज दैत्यनरनारायणस्येत्यादि विविध विरुद्राज्ये विराजमान महाराजाधिराजश्रीमन्मदनसिंहदेवानाम् संभुज्यमान विजयराज-राज्ये ठक्कुर श्रीगङ्गया······लिखितम्–इति "

   The colophon of the Narasiṃha-Purāṇa (Sāstrī, Catalogue, p. 29) reads : '' लसं ३३९ श्रावण सुदि षष्ठ्याम् रविवासरे महाराजाधिराज श्रीमन्मदनसिंहदेवानाम् विजयिनाम् शासति गोरक्षपुरे सिपाहकठक्के सदुपाध्याय श्रीरुद्रनाथशर्मभि: नारसिंहाख्यमद:पुराणम् लेरिय " ; also cf. Mitra-Majumdar, Op. Cit. 38.
2. Sāstrī, Catalogue, p. 229 : ' इति श्रीशक्तिसिंहात्मज महाराजाधिराज मदनसिंहदेव विरचिते मदनरत्नप्रदीपे प्रायश्चितविवेक: ······संवत् ८४८ (नेवार) "
3. JASB, 1903, pt. i, pp. 16 ff ; Mitra-Majumdar, Op. Cit. 38 ; Singh, 83.

Mithilā tradition asserts that one Maithila Kāyastha Majumdar, one Majlis Khan and others were the immediate successors of the Oinavāras. They paid tribute to Babar. They were probably petty zamindars who flourished on the ruins of the Oinavāras.

CHAPTER VII

LIFE AND CONDITION OF THE PEOPLE

(1097 A. D.—1526 A.D.)

The end of the Karṇāṭas and the Oinavāras was tragic. Political status apart, Mithilā lost her cultural hold, to a considerable extent, in the following period. But, the period under review had definite contributions in the spheres of art and literature. In this respect the Mithilā of the Karṇāṭas and the Oinavāras resembled that of the Janakas and Yājñavalkya. The two periods, though standing apart by about four thousand years, have somewhat their similar contributions to the growth of human mind in general and Indian culture in particular.

POLITY

From the study of the books of the authoritative commentary-writers of the time it appears that the study of politics had a similar history as the study of law in the country. Before the coming of the Mohammedans into this country Digests of Hindu Law began to be composed by Hindu writers. It was exactly the case with the Digests of politics. They also marked a new stage about the same time in the *Artha-śāstra* literature. *Rājanīti-Kalpataru* by Lakṣmīdhara Bhaṭṭa, the Foreign-Minister of king Govindachandra Gāhaḍavāla of Kānyakubja and Kāśī, probably forms the earliest of the series of these Political Digests[1].

1. JBORS. XI. 68.

This trend of writing digests is significant in as much as it reflects a new outlook of the writers of the age and pointedly shows that the writing of Digests was at the time much in favour and the Hindu writers had ceased to produce original works.

The number of authorities quoted in these Digests, for example Caṇḍeśvara's *Rājanīti-Ratnākara*, indicates that several Arthaśāstra-writers had already flourished before. Moreover, in the Political Science Digests, sometimes it becomes quite impossible to fix whether a passage comes from a Dharmaśāstra or an Arthaśāstra, for the *Dharmaśāstrakāras* have also their views on politics and they generally have a chapter on constitutional laws Sometimes, the passages from the books of different authorities are so mixed up that they can hardly be separated. The authors, quoted or mentioned, in these commentaries are all later than Kauṭilya or Kāmandaka. These digest-writers nodoubt incorporated their own comments and interpretations but these, too, were mostly in line with the arguments presented by the ancient authorities. Caṇḍeśvara has extensively quoted in his *Rājanīti-Ratnākara* from Gopāla's *Rājanīti-Kāmadhenu* and Lakṣmīdhara Bhaṭṭa's *Kalpataru* (Rājadharma Section). These facts distinctly speak of a new trend or tendency to present the digests based on the labours of earlier authors. The borrowing tendency often exceeded the proper limit, as is evident in the case of Caṇḍeśvara's *Vivāda-Ratnākara* wherein practically the whole book of Lakṣmīdhara Bhaṭṭa's *Kalpataru* on *Vyavahāra* has been incorporated[1].

1. RR. (Edited by Jayaswal), intro. 21.

Notwithstanding, Caṇḍeśvara's *Rājanīti-Ratnākara* is valuable in the sense that it introduces us to a new branch of literature and is probably the oldest work of that branch. About the 11th century A. D., the new class of literature on political science came into existence, viz., Digests of Hindu Politics, mainly based on the former *Artha-śāstras*, *Daṇḍa-nītis* and *Dharma-śastras*. They preferred the Dharma-śāstra principles of Politics ; ignored the old titles like Arthaśāstra and Daṇḍanīti and adopted a new term – "*Rājanīti*" or "Royal Principle" (or Policy). These writers were also the lawyers of the Dharma-Sāstra School and composers of Dharma Law Digests. To this class belong Caṇḍeśvara, Lakṣmīdhara, Vācaspati, Nīlakaṇṭha and others.

The advent of the Muslims in India in the 11th century A. D. brought in its wake another crisis in a more menacing nature. The Hindus had lost their political independence. The strain on the cohesion of the Hindu society was fast reaching the breaking point. It was at this critical stage that the Brāhmaṇas essayed and re-inforced the tottering edifices as far as possible. Having lost control on politics and economics, they concentrated themselves mainly on social and domestic life. The result was the writing of Digests and codification of the laws and regulations and rules of conduct in various walks of life. These Smṛti works because of their "intrinsic merit and innate strength inspite of age-old aberrations,"[1] could preserve the individuality of the Hiudu society. "Mithilā,

1. JBORS. XIII. (Search for Sanskrit & Prākṛt MSS. in Bihar and Orissa, iii iv).

being one of the chief centres of Hindu learning, it is not surprising to find an individual tradition of the texts"[1].

ADMINISTRATION

In the light of the information furnished by these digests it appears that benevolent and enlightened monarchy functioned in Mithilā under the Karṇaṭa kings. From Nānyadeva down to Rāmasiṃhadeva there took place no change in the status of the kings whose authority was absolute. They were, however, no autocrats as understood in the modern conception of the term. They were kind, generous and benevolent, and worked for the welfare of the people. Ministers or advisers were there, but we do not know if ever the kings abided by their counsel. We also do not know if they maintained separate departments for various affairs, as we certainly do in the following period.

A great change in the administrative set-up in the land followed Rāmasiṃha's death. It is said that he was a cruel despot. His tyrant-like acts offended the nobles (courtiers) who were not prepared to take it lying down. They were united and determined to resist his action. The ultimate clash resulted in an unprecedented constitutional change that Mithilā had hardly experienced before. One of his ministers established a Council of Seven Elders as a check upon his autocratic powers. In other words, according to the earlier constitutional tradition, the king was under a Council of Elders. The specific mention of the term "Seven" probably points to the seven ministers for seven or more

1. Ibid.

departments dealing with the various affairs of the country. Jayaswal suggests that this Council was either for the first time introduced or came in power in the reign of Śaktisiṃha, Harisiṃha's predecessor or a generation earlier.[1] But the nature of the circumstances leading to the formation of this Council by " one of the ministers " unequivocally suggests that there were no such Councils before Śaktisiṃha, though there were ministers advising and assisting the kings. It also shows that the ministers now wielded considerable power and could effect desired reforms or checks. The nobles' hand in forcing changes in the constitition obviously makes us guess that this was a Feudal Baronical Council to whose existence the introduction to the *Sugati-sopāna* also testifies.[2]

Caṇḍeśvara writes in his introduction to the *Kṛtya-Ratnākara* that Devāditya, his grand-father, served as senior Minister of Peace and War.[3] Caṇḍeśvara's father Vīreśvara also succeeded to that post probably about 1310 A.D. (or in Śaka 1236, *i.e.* 1314 A.D.). We have also mention of one Gaṇeśvara (Caṇḍeśvara's uncle) who was the *Mantrin* and *Mahāmattaka* (Chief Minister) of Harisiṃhadeva. A verse in the introduction to Gaṇeśvara's *Sugati-sopāna* [4] shows that he presided over the Council of the feudatory rulers of Mithilā and that he was

1. RR. 24.
2. Ibid; DDG. 16.
3. " सप्रक्रियमहा-सान्धि-विग्रहिक ठक्कुरदेवादित्यमहामत्त · ·"(Vide-Sāstrī, Nepal Cat. I,132; RR. 14,fn.3.
4. R. S. Cat. No. 1864, verse 5: "श्रीमानेष महामहत्तकमहाराजाधिराजो महासामन्ताधिपतिर्विकस्वरयशः पुष्पस्य जन्मद्रुमः । चक्रे मैथिलभूमिनाथपतिभिः सप्ताङ्गराज्यस्थिति (म्) प्रौढानेकवशंवदैव हृदयो दोःस्तम्भसम्भावितः ।।"

the Chief of feudatories with the high sounding title of *Mahārājādhirāja*, which is repeated in the colophon to Nepal copy of the year 1343, and in the books cf Gaṇeśvara's son Rāmadatta. The beginning verse in the introduction to Chāndogya–Mantroddhāra is of great interest. It throws a vivid light on certain administrative aspects [1]

Firstly, these Minister-Thakkuras were feudal barons. That position, according to Jayaswal, would also justify the high titles given to these Thakkuras in their books. Moreover, the term "Thakkura" itself signifies "a baron". [2]

Secondly, the Chief Minister also used to preside over the Cabinet, *i.e.* Council of Elders, like the present day cabinets.

Thirdly, the Chief feudal baron also used to be the Chief of Council.

And, lastly, the post of Chief Minister was hereditary as we find in the case of Caṇḍeśvara whose father end grandfather held the same position. But the most striking point to take note of is that all these ministers were great scholars and law-givers of the time, which would justify their claim to the high exalted position. Our assertion finds full confirmation in the case of Thakkura Rāmadatta son of Gaṇeśvara who rose to be a minister while his

1. Chāndogya-mantroddhāra, intro. verse I : "महाराजाधिराजस्य महासामन्तपालिनो महामहन्तकेशस्य श्रीगणेश्वरसूनुना" The title "the chief (or protector) of the great Samantas (feudal rulers)" (पण्डित-महामहत्तक-महासामन्ताधिपति श्रीगणेश्वर विरचितं) occurs also in the colophon to Gaṅgā-pattalaka by Gaṇeśvara (R. S. Cat. 1923-24).
2. RR. 17 fn. 2-3.

father held the post of Mahāmattaka, under Narasiṃha-deva, a title also borne by Caṇḍeśvara.[1] We have mention of one Bhavāditya, brother of Devāditya who was a "Rāja-vallabha" (a courtier, an *ade-de camp*). The list also speaks of the various departments in the State functioning probably under the above Council.

But soon afterwards things seem to have moved fast for, the mention of this Council of Elders is nowhere to be found in Caṇḍeśvara's *Rājanīti Ratnākara*, though the author himself, *i e.*, Caṇḍeśvara (Harisiṃha's Minister) is referred to as Caṇḍeśvara Mantrin or Minister of State, "son of the Baron Śrī Vīreśvara with insignia, the senior Minister of Peace and War".[2] From *Vyavahāra-Ratnākara* we learn that at the time of its writing he (Caṇḍeśvara) combined in himself the office of the Chief Justice (*Prādvivāka*) of Mithilā and the important charge of Peace and War.

In his *Rājanīti-Ratnākara* Caṇḍeśvara contemplates a Hindu King under and dependant on an Emperor as he found his own master Bhaveśa.[3] Caste in politics by then

1. cf. Pañjī (Candra Jha, p. 264). This Rāmadatta also wrote Vājasaneyī-vivāha-paddhati (Daśa-Karma) and Mahā-dāna-paddhati (on great gifts), of which the former is the leading canon in Mithilā up to the present time.
2. Colophon to RR. p 77 : " इति सप्रक्रियमहासान्धिविग्रहिकठक्कुर श्रीवीरेश्वरात्मज श्रीचण्डेश्वरविरचिते" His Ratnākara is divided in seven sections—Kṛtya R., Dāna R., Vyavahāra R., Sudhi R., Pūjā R., Vivāda R., and Gṛhastha R. The Vivāda-Ratnākara deals with law and has been the ruling authority in the Mithilā School of Hindu law for the past six centuries.

   Also cf. Mitra, Notices, VI. p. 134 ; V. p, 243 ; Ind. Off. Cat. No. 1387; BORS. Cat. No. 2240.
3. RR. 4: " सम्राजे करदो यः सकरः.. लोके तु राजेति सकरः"

seems to have become bankrupt for, according to him, sovereign may be of any caste.[1] Thus, he differs from the theory of the Dharma-śāstra-writers and betrays his quick changing aptitude for the changing times, Sacrament of coronation was not essential for kingship. This was quite in conformity with "hard facts and new facts for the Delhi emperors had been on the throne, even over Hindu kings without any Vedic consecration". The Muslim Emperors were now fully established and there was no hope of a Hindu restoration. Theories must be dynamic, and not static. They must always change with times. And, therefore, it was but natural that a seasoned statesman like Caṇḍeśvara should have realised that the Aitareya and Śatapatha Brāhmaṇas had ceased to rule. He laid down the definition- 'one, who protects, is the king"[2] and rejected the authority of Gopāla (in the *Rājanīti-Kāmadhenu*) and others emphasising consecration. He, citing Bṛhaspati, "cooly pointed out to a conqueror and said that the consecration theory fails."[3]

As regards the general subjects his views are traditional and as such very valuable. For instance, on succession to to a kingdom, he writes that the "ordinary rule of division and succession cannot apply to a kingdom (for the royal property is owned by the whole people). They all have a share in it (the poor, orphans etc) and that leadership, if devided, would destroy the state".[4] He quotes a text

1. Ibid. ?.
2. Ibid : "प्रजारक्षको राजेत्यर्थ:"
3. Ibid. intro.25; p. 3.
4. Ibid. 72 : "राजधने दीनानाथादिसकलप्राणिनामंशित्वं बहुनायकत्वाद्राज्य-विनाशश्चेति...."

wherein prajā or the subjects have been described as Viṣṇu[1]. This divine position of the subjects as against the king is in consonance with the early theory of Hindu politics "for in *Sānti parvan*[2] of the Mahābhārata, the coronation-oath lays down that the country is God and that the king in protecting it will consider it as such."[3] Thus, Caṇḍeśvara's text becomes more intelligible when read with the coronation-oath of the Mahābhārata.

We have some very interesting information relating to the then administrative set-up of the country from the RR. It is divided into 16 chapters—(1) Kingship (dealing with the various duties of a king),[4] (2) Ministers (dealing with the different qualities that make a minister, and his functions),[5] (3) Minister of Religion (*Purohitāditaraṅgaḥ*—a detailed mention of his religious functions),[6] (4) Lord Chief Justice (*Prādvivākaḥ*—his full acquaintance with legal matters and strong presence of mind),[7] (5) Councillors (*Sabhyanirūpaṇam*—Members or Sabhyas or Sabhāsadas of the Council of the king's court—their learning and scholarchip),[8] (6) Forts (their construction and strategic

1. Ibid. XVI.74 : "इति सर्वं प्रजाविष्णुं साक्षिणं श्रावयेन्मुहुः"
2. Ch. 59, Verse 106 : "प्रतिज्ञां चाभिरोहस्व मनसा कर्मणा गिरा, पालयिष्याम्यहं भौमं ब्रह्मइत्येव चासकृत्" ie. "Mount on the Pratijñā (take the oath) mentally, physically and verbally (without any mental reservation)."
3. RR. Intro. 25 ff.
4. pp. 2-9.
5. pp. 10-13.
6. pp. 14-15.
7. pp. 16-17.
8. pp. 18-23.

importance),[1] (7) Discussion of Policy (*Mantraṇā*, its importance and formation according to the time, place, and action).[2] Where there is harmony among ministers there is no fear. The petty squibblings and the selfishness of ministers are bound to spell disaster on the country and its people. A minister must be intelligent and well-versed in various administrative affairs. This is the key to his success. (8) Treasury (the national exchequer, its use),[3] (9) Army (its different components and safeguard against the enemy invasion),[4] (10) Leadership of the Army or the Commander-in-Chief (*Senānī*, his duties)[5] (11) Ambassadors (*Dūtādi*)[6]. He must be well-versed in all the literature (*sarva-śāstra-viśāradam*), talented (*Medhāvī*) simple by nature (*śuddhaṃ jīvanamācaret*), quick to understand even the minutest details, well behaved (*bhadra*), tolerant and patient. (12) Administration[7]. The king must be just and love his subjects like his own self, protect them and act wisely in times of peace and war (*Sandhiṃ ca Vigrahaṃ* ....). In other words, the king must know every detail of administration and possess the capacity for coping with any new situation whatsoever.

This chapter is most significant in that it throws a very interesting light on the working of the village-administration. We have references to "*Gulma*" consisting

1. pp. 24- 26.
2. pp. 27- 30.
3. pp. 31- 32.
4. pp. 33- 38.
5. pp. 39-41.
6. pp. 42 54.
7. pp. 55-61.

of 3 to 5 villages ; "*Rāṣṭra*" consisting of hundreds of villages; "*Grāmapati*" or "*Grāmādhipati*" (*i.e.*, village-head), '*Daśa-Grāmapati*" (Head of ten ; villages) ; "*Viṃśatiṃśa-grāmapati*" (Head of twenty or thirty villages), and "*Sahasra-grāmapati* (Head of a thousand villages)[1]. These village-heads were appointed in order of merit and efficiency[2]—a system, more or less similar to the Mansabadārī system introduced by the Moghul Emperor Akbar about 200 years later. Every village had its Headman. If ever there arose a quarrel or strife among the village-inhabitants, and the Village-Head proved unable to settle the issue it was his duty to refer it to the higher authority, *i.e.*, the Head of Ten Villages, who promptly took up the matter and talked it. If the latter also failed, he referred it to the Head of Twenty Villages; the latter in turn to the Head of the Hundred Villages, and the latter in case of failure personally presented the case before the highest authority, *i.e.*, the Head of the Thousand Villages[3]. In return to their services the payments made to these different categories of the village-heads also varied. Whatever the villagers paid in kind, *i.e.*, crops, woods, etc.,

1. p. 60 : "द्वयोस्त्रयाणां पञ्चानां मध्ये गुल्मप्रतिष्ठितम् । तथा ग्रामशतानां च कुर्य्याद्राष्ट्रस्य संग्रहम् ।। ग्रामस्याधिपतिं कुर्य्याद्दशग्रामपतिं तथा । विंशतीशं शतेशं च सहस्रपतिमेव च"
2. Ibid : "एकस्य दशानां विंशते: शतस्य सहस्रस्य वा ग्रामाधिपतिमेकं कुर्य्यात् लाघव-गौरवापेक्ष उक्तविकल्प:"
3. p. 60. :

"ग्रामे दोषान् समुत्पन्नान् ग्रामिक: शनकै: स्वयम्
शंसेद् ग्रामदशेशाय दशेशो विंशतीशने
विंशतीशस्तु तत्सर्वं शतेशाय निवेदयेत्
शंसेद् ग्रामशतेशस्तु सहस्रपतये स्वयम्"

to the king as taxes, was given by the latter to the *Grāmādhipati* on account of his salary. The Head of the Ten Villages (*Daśeśa*) was given as much land as he could cultivate with one plough ; the Head of Twenty Villages (*Viṃśatīśa*) enjoyed as much land as he could till with four ploughs ; the Head of the Hundred Villages (*Śateśa*) enjoyed one village and the Head of the Thousand Villages (*Sahasrādhipati*) enjoyed a city or a town[1].

Besides these Village-Heads, the king also appointed a minister (close to him—"*snigdhaḥ*"—may be some one belonging to the Royal Family) who looked after and supervised the works of those different graded heads. Probably a Ministry for Rural Affairs also functioned and the Minister-in-Charge was the chief authority[2]. His power seems to have been "absolute" (*atantritaḥ*). There was also a high official "*Sarvāthacintakam*" functioning in every city or town who was to those village-officers as *Rāhu* is to the planets[3]. This shows that the very presence of the authority struck terror into the hearts of the wrong-doers. This "Sarvāthacintakam" probably corresponds to some law-giving-authority or the Justice of the modern time.

1. p. 61.

"यानि राजप्रदेयानि प्रत्यहं ग्रामवासिभि:
अन्न पानेन्धनादीनि ग्रामिकस्तान्यवाप्नुयात्
दशी हलं तु भुञ्जीत विंशी पञ्चहलानि च
ग्रामं ग्रामशताध्यक्ष: सहस्राधिपति: पुरम्"

2. p. 61 : "तेषाँ ग्राम्याणि कार्य्याणि पृथक्कार्य्याणि चैव हि राज्ञोऽन्यस्सचिव: स्निग्धस्तानि पश्येदतन्द्रित: "

3. p. 61 : "नगरे नगरे चैकं कुर्य्यात्सर्वार्थचिन्तकम्
उच्चै: स्थानं घोररूपं नक्षत्राणामिव ग्रहम् "

The system of village-administration as enumerated in the passages of *Rājanīti-Ratnākara* amply illustrates the keen interest shown by the king or the Royal Authority for the welfare of the general mass.

(13) Executive Authority and Punishment (*Daṇḍa*)[1]—punishment was held necessary for it is the punishment that keeps the subjects disciplined ; that makes the unconscious conscious; that makes one lead the righteous path of life. (14) Abdication and Appointment[2]—a weak or old king must abdicate in favour of the his eldest son and aim at solvation. Here we get a glimpse into the medieval conception of kingship for we are told that the king is but God incarnate[3]. (15) Appointment of a new king by the Minister of Religion and other ministers. This chapter is also important for it shows that the Minister for Religious Affairs usually performed the ceremony according to Vedic rites as in ancient times[4]. The hold of religion on politics was a common factor all over the Medieval world in the East as well as in the West. (16) Coronation[5], referred to above.

The following period, that of the Oinavāras witnessed almost the same administrative pattern as in the preceding one. The question of independent monarchy had far receded into oblivion. The period, however, records the birth of great law-givers like the celebrated Vācaspati, Pakṣadhara, Vardhamāna, Misaru Miśra, Keśava Narahari and others.

1. pp. 62-65.
2. pp. 66-69.
3. p. 68 : " महती देवता ह्येषा नररूपेण तिष्ठति "
4. pp. 70-74.
5. pp. 73-77.

The tendency to write Digests, initiated and encouraged by Caṇḍeśvara developed more and more during this period. Numerous books on the laws of sale, inheritance, barter, loans, possession, mortgage, interest, bail, repayment of debts, legal possession of the born blind, manumission of slaves, disputes regarding ownership, boundary-disputes, protection of crops, division of a deceased father's estate, disqualification to inherit indivisible property, women's property, judicature, defence, ordeals, judgement, execution etc., were either written, digested or compiled. But, be it Misaru Miśra's *Vivāda-candra* or Vardhamāna's *Daṇḍa-viveka*, Vidyāpati's *Vibhāgasāra* or Murāri Miśra's *Ekadaśādyadhikaraṇa* (dealing with domestic and foreign affairs as a sequel to his work on *Bādhābbhyuccayalakṣaṇa*, *i.e.*, on the political obstacles), or Vācaspati's *Vyavahāra-cintāmaṇi*, the fact remains that all these works, particularly those dealing exclusively with administrative affairs, are founded principally on the *Kalpataru*, *Kāmadhenu-ratnākara*, *Vyavahāra-Tilaka* etc., and the original texts of the great ancient law-givers such as Manu, Yājñavalkya and others with their Commentaries.

The Varṇana-Ratnākara[1] of Jyotirīśvara is also much valuable as "a compendium of life and culture in Medieval India". It presents a vivid picture of court-life and its sorroundings which reminds one of the Ain i-Akbari. The list of officers and courtiers given under *āsthāna-varṇanā* (or description of the court) is longer than similar lists in any other works of the time, and they are mutually

1. Edited by S. K. Chatterji & Srikant Mishra, published by the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1940.

complementary[1]. We have references to *Bhūpāla*, *Māṇḍalika*, *Sāmanta*, *Senāpati*, *Purapati*, *Mantrī*, *Purohita*, *Dharmādhikaraṇi*, *Sāndhivigrahika*, *Mahāmahattaka*, *Pratibala-karaṇādhyakṣa*, *Śāntikaraṇika*, *Rājaguru*, *Durgapāla* and others[2]. Thus we find that the RR. and the VR. complement each other.

Of the administrative set-up and the various departments maintained by the Oinavāra kings we have no clear account. But the nature of dignatories conferred on the courtiers and the ministers does certainly tend to show that all the departments, enumerated by Caṇḍeśvara in his RR., were fully maintained and actively developed. We have references to *Dharmādhikaraṇika* (Judge or Chief Justice), *Mantrī* (Minister), *Pariṣad* (Officer or Courtier), Minister of Peace and War, Minister for Religious Affairs, etc., already referred to in the preceding pages. These sundry references pointedly indicate that no change of fundamental nature had taken place in the once-established constitutional set-up, although numerous storms had raged in and blown over the land.

SOCIETY

The Maithilas were extraordinarily devoted to "mint, amice, cumin of the Brāhmaṇic law" in their every day-life. The excessive orthodoxy and conservativeness have been their undying characteristics. For centuries it has been a

1. VR. Intro. xxxiii.
2. Ibid. pp. 8-9. For traditional अभिषेक वर्णना (Coronation), see pp. 22-23.

tract too proud to admit other nationalities to intercourse on equal terms, and has passed through conquest after conquest, from the north, from the east and from the west without changing its ancestral peculiarities[1]. The society stood rock-like and survived all the catastrophes. Numerous books on Smṛti, daily duties, marriages, religious rites, *svayaṃvara*, prohibited degrees of relationship, performance of and officiating at sacrifices, purification, morning-duties of the Śūdras, the five daily *yajñas*, duties of Brāhmaṇas, agriculture, commerce, duties of Kṣatriyas and Vaiśyas etc., were either written or digested or compiled[2]. But nothing new, nothing revolutionary, nothing extraordinary in the shape of changes in the society is perceptible anywhere during the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries inspite of hundreds of books produced.

The advent of the fourteenth century, however, witnessd a significant change in the social status of the Maithilas—significant because it violently shook up the very structure of the society. Instead of giving a progressive outlook to it, it was made more rigid and more conservative. The new change was the introduction of the Maithila "*Kulīnism*"—a legacy later borrowed by Bengal (?) and Assam[3]. The credit for this so-called re-organisation of the Maithila society (1310 or 1313 A.D.)[4] in the name

1. Grierson, Linguistic Survey of India, Vol. V, pt. ii, p. 4.
2. cf. Gṛhastha-Ratnākara (Mitra, Notices, V, Nos. 1921, 1779, 1830, 1834, 1837 etc ; II, No. 1251).
3. HML. I, p. 28, fn. 78 ; N. N. Vasu, Social History of Kāmarūpa, II, p. 168.
4. cf. HML. I, p. 27, fn. 74. This custom of keeping geneologies goes back to about 1100 A. D., but Harisiṃhadeva ordered detailed geneologies to be scientifically recorded for the first time on Pañjīs.

of '*Kulīnism*' goes entirely to king Harisiṃhadeva, the last king of the Karṇāṭa line. As a consequence, in their social structure the Maithilas gave birth to an elaborate system of geneological records called in common parlance, the *Pañjīs*. It is said that the system was introduced with a view to protecting the "purity of blood" in Maithila society by making people record their ancestry, and avoiding the forbidden degrees of relationship and marriages[1].

How did this "*Pañjī*" (or Pañjī-Prabandha) come into existence ? The story goes : "a Maithila Brāhmaṇa, Paṇḍita Harinātha Upādhyāya by name, had by an oversight contracted a marriage not in consonance with Śāstric texts. Once his wife was alleged to have had an illicit connection with an impure man and made to submit to an ordeal to prove her innocence by taking a fire-ball in her hand—a test in vogue in ancient days. Her hands began to scorch—a contingency possible only in case she was sinful. Knowing that she was perfectly innocent, she solicited re-trial and was tested again. She had used the words 'I have not had intercourse with any impure person' ("*nāhaṃ Cāṇḍālagāminī*"),—at the former ordeal. At the second one she swore "I have not had any intercourse with any impure person other than my husband" (*nāhaṃ svapativyatirikta Cāṇḍālagāminī* "), and this time the fire did not burn her. On careful examination it was found that her husband was impure because he had married a lady who was not as enjoined by the Śāstras sufficiently removed in descent of relationship. This incident created a deep sensation in the whole of Mithilā".[2] We are

1. JBRS. XXXIII. 55 ; also cf. HML. I, 27.
2. JBORS. III. 516.

further told that the Paṇḍita felt so much humiliated that he at once undertook to write in Sanskrit, and composed in 1313 A. D. a geneology of the Maithila Brāhmaṇas and Maithila Kāyasthas, which is since that year kept with scrupulous exactness uptodate with fresh entries made from time to time. Harisiṃhadeva, the then king, interested himself in the said geneology and the marriage customs of Mithilā. He not only supervised the marriage being done according to the Śāstric rules, but made classification of Maithila Brāhmaṇas and Kāyasthas according to their religious observances. The Brāhmaṇas-let alone the other castes-were now forced to split up themselves into four sub-classes: (i) The *Srotiyas*, *i. e.*, the Maithila Brāhmaṇas who performed the agnihotra sacrifices and who devoted their time from sun-rise to sun-set to religious worship. They were given the first place in order of "Kulīnism"; (ii) The *Yogyas* (deserving). They were next to the Śrotiyas, who got the second class; (iii) The *Pañjibādhs*. Next to Yogyas were the Pañjibādhs who were placed in the third class, and (iv) next to the Pañjībādh were the *Jaibārs* who composed the fourth class.[1]

In justification of this classification betrayig fissiparous tendencies we are told that Harisiṃhadeva caused this classification because he wanted to encourage " religious observances amongst the people to show that in this world and specially so in Mithilā – the country of the Janakas, the King Initiates - spiritual should be the ideal of every man".[2] And, it was with a view to perpetuating "this

1. Ibid. 516 ; Also cf. PUJ. I, No. ii, pp. 11 ff : HML. I, 27-31.
2. JBORS. III. 516.

ideal and rendering it all the more attractive", that he ordered and incorporated the order in the marriage-rules that "distinctive preference" should be shown to each other in marriage-parties " by one lower in grade to the other who is in the higher grade."[1] These "rules" have been implicitly followed through centuries upto the present time. Harisiṃhadeva, the gretest protagonist of these rules, is no more. Even his family has faded away from the memory of the people save a few students of history. But the "marriage-rules" are unaffected and yet dominate the the social life of the Maithilas with all their implications.

These rules gave birth to a new class - the class of *Pañjīkāras* and *Ghaṭakas*, *i. e.*, the " marriage contractors." Harisiṃha had made it compulsory for every person to "get a certificate of the fact that the contracting parties are not within the forbidden bounds of consanguinity." It ultimately necessitated officials who must discharge this duty to preserve "the purity of blood." As a result, we had the Pañjīkāras who kept these geneological records of gigantic proportions and were fully authorised to issue such " marriage-certificates" without which no marriages could be contracted or performed.

The procedure was as follows. A Śrotiya (highest in grade) wishing to give his daughter in marriage obtained from an authorised geneologist, the *Pañjiara* (Pañjīkāra) an " *Adikāramālā* " (certificate of right, *i. e.*, the list of persons with the names of their fathers and grandfathers with whom the intended bride had no relationship, according to the Śāstric rules and with whom the marriage was

1. Ibid.

allowable).[1] That person then selected provisionally one or more bridegrooms and obtained a "marriage-permit" signed in each case by the Ruling authority who was supposed to be the Head of the Maithila Brāhmaṇas in the cast-matters also — a remarkable symbol of Medieval religio-politics practised all the world over.

As regards the other division - Yogyas, Pañjibādhs and Jaibāras - the authorised geneologists (Pañjīkāras) had the permission of the Ruling authority to settle marriages "with due deference to the Śāstric rules and local customs." And, on the mutual agreement between the the parties concerned the marriage or marriages were finally performed according to the Vedic rites, *i.e.*, *Brahma* form of marriage which is one of the eight forms of marriage recognised by Manu, the Supreme authority.

Like the Brāhmaṇas the Kāyasthas also were forced to split up themselves into two divisions - (1) the *Kulīnas* (*i. e.*, of the high birth) and (2) the *Gṛhasthas* (*i. e.*, of ordinary birth). The same "Mūlas" were also thrust on them as those on the Brāhmaṇas. They also got the "certificate of marriage" by the Pañjīkāras, called the "Kāyastha-Pañjīkāras."[2]

The exponents of this outstanding social reform might have had some honest motive - for instance, preserving social order and encuraging virtuous and noble life - behind their zeal, but the only motive we can see through now, seems to have been the so-called "preservation of the

1. Ibid.
2. Such geneological records were not limited to Brāhmaṇas and Kāyasthas only, those of Kṣatriyas are also known to have existed. (cf. HML. I. 3o, fn. 78 ; Das, II, p. 16).

purity of blood." This, in turn, instead of proving a boon spelt severe curses on the society and caused devastating impact on the morale of the people.

. Firstly, a rigid religious basis it struck at the very root of the society; disintegrated it to the core; fostered bitter jealousy and hatred amongst the newly constituted sub-classes within a class and virtually turned it into so many warring camps, each section trying to beat down the other.

Secondly, the marriage must be arranged between the members of the same sub-class or else they must face excommunication, sometimes disinheritance too, by the members of their own sub-class.

Thirdly, one higher in grade was naturally supposed to recover from the other of the lower grade. In other words, the "matrimonial alliances" turned in course of time into " monetary alliances."

Fourthly, the agnates or the *Sapiṇḍas* and *Sagotras* (of the same *gotra*) according to Śāstric injections must not marry.

Fifthly, besides the classes of Ghaṭakas (marriage-contractors) and the Pañjīkāras (geneologists) it gave rise to a new system of contracting marriage, *i. e.*, "the Sabhāgāchī-marriages.[1]" This custom has now degenerated to such a ridiculous form that it constitutes a perpetual blot on the fair name of the land. Moreover, the institution of the Ghaṭakas, which grew out of this very peculiarity in Maithila society, indulged in unfair means. In course

1. Sabhāgāchī is the place where people from all parts of Mithilā assemble on fixed dates and negotiate marriages.

of time they turned professionals and the Pañjīkāras became the hereditary ones irrespective of their learning and efficiency.

Sixthly, a new ferocious monster of "Bikauās" was born. The Maithila scholars style them as "*Maithila kulīnas*" or "*Bhalamānusas.*"[1] But as Risley calls them, they were "Bikauās" (a term widely current in Mithilā) meaning "the vendors" who married sometimes as many as forty to fifty wives.[2] Formerly the classification of the Kulīnas was based on the sole merit of religious observances but later, owing to the exaggerated importance placed on the value of being born in a "high *Kula*", they gave up all their sacred practices and adopted marriage as profession instead. This emerged in the worst type of polygamy which gradually became the order of the day. Though poor, disabled, illiterate and stupid they were yet the' '*Kulīnas*" of the society, whereas those of the so-called lower grade were held in low estimation and contempt inspite of their learning and wit. The result was obvious. Growing demoralisation and the more and more hatered of one section against another infested the very soul of the society.

And lastly, the condition of women became worse. Daughters could easily be sold away by their parents for a few coins. The fifteenth century no doubt produced a Lakhimā, Dhīramati, Viśvāsadevī, and Candrakalā (Vidyāpati's daughter-in-law), but the following period proved quite dismal. They were now virtual prisoners in their own homes. Education to them began to be regarded by

1. cf. HML I, 30-31.
2. The People of India, 215.

the society as "a thing of ridicule and contempt." The tradition of Maitreyī, Gārgī, Lakhimā and others was ignonimously cast to the four winds.

Child-marriage found a great impetus. Most af these unfortunate girls could hardly see their husbands' places (even their husbands) once or twice in their life-time. The number of widows grew awfully staggering, for the death one man caused the ultimate tragic widowhood of at least twenty to thirty women. The result was glaring. The ill-fated girls were reduced to a band of despised creatures worse than the slaves.

The condition of women in general was demoralising. The Śūdras and the women were placed in the same category [1] The society had no respect for them. They were treated as an object of luxury and sexual gratification. In Jyotirīśvara's VR. we have both sides of female-character. But, unfortunately the black side has been depicted with more enthusiasm, as if it were with a vengeance. The horror of the burning-ghat has been compared to "the inscrutable character of a woman."[2] Female-character is like "darkness, deep and unseen."[3]

Prostitution was now an established institution in the society. The prostitutes are declared as "shameless creatures who have no ways and whose love is only for money."[4]

1. JBRS. XXXVII, pt i- ii, pp. 121 ff.
2. VR. 17 : " स्त्रीक चरित्र अइसन् दुर्लक्ष्य "
3. Ibid. 54 : " स्त्रीक चरित्र अइसन दारुण "
4. Ibid. 26- 27 ; " निर्लज्ज, आचारहीन, निर्गति, निराश्रय,.. धनार्थे प्रेम लोभार्थे विनय .." " वेश्या अइसन परअनुग्राहक " (p. 66); also see JBRS. XXXVII, pts. i- ii, pp. 121- 23 ; XXXVI, pts iii- iv, pp. 183- 91.

The society had all hatred for them. Their position was worst in society which had no sympathy for their economic condition that was mainly responsible for the growth and development of this institution.

Women also prctised *sati*. Bhavasiṃha's two wives became *sati* on the bank of the Vāgmatī river. Lakhimā is also said to have become *sati* on hearing the death of her husband, Śivasiṃhadeva. The sundry references show that women belonging to the higher order (not in general) practised this age-old system in Mithilā in the medieval age. The system was, however, abolished two centuries later through legislation in the time of Akbar.

Agriculture was the occupation of mainly the Vaiśyas and the members of the lower grade. A great part of the land was wild, barren and sparsely cultivated. Cultivation was carried on with difficulty only by the aid of great irrigation works widely spread over the country, and dating from pre-historic times.[1] There were banana-trees in every home of Mithilā. The travellers used to eat *cividayāṇi* and rice cooked in milk. From the travellers' account it appears that there were plenty of *vāpī*, *kūpa*, *taḍāga* (tank) and rivers." "In this country the man in the street is also expert in Sanskirt learning. The city of Mithilā, which is full of wealth, is at present called *Jagayī*."[2] The peasantry, however, do not appear to have been adventurous and enterprising. Trade and commerce was practically unknown.

1. Grierson, Linguistic Survey of India, V, pt. ii, p. 4; JBRS. XXXIII, 47-48.
2. cf. Mithilā tīrtha-kalpa in the Jainā Vividhatīrthakalpa or Kalpapradīpa by Jaina Prabhu Suri of the 14th V S. (Vide- JIH. XXVII, 295 - 96).

That the Maithila society of the eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries A. D. was more or less the same as it is today can be easily determined from Jyotirīśvara's *Varṇana-Ratnākara* (c. 1324 A.D.) which presents a lively picture of the Maithila society in particular and that of North-eastern India in general[1]. It gives us a veritable 'Bihar Court Life' for the fourteenth century. According to Dr. S. K. Chatterji the Mithilā of Jyotirīśvara was "peaceful and happy."[2] "Peace" perhaps there was, but of "happiness" we have no mention whatever in the VR. Society existed then just as it does now. There were the same kings and subjects, Āryas and Mlecchas, Brāhmaṇas and Śūdras, caste-divisions and class-divisions, luxury with all its evils and the shocking cry of appalling poverty. The palaces abounded with beautiful damsels surrounded by thousands of maids and slave-girls while the streets were littered with hoardes of starved beggars, and shame-faced prostitutes. Moreover, the citadels of culture—the towns were full of "thieves", "gamblers", "pick-pockets", "debauches" & etc.[3] The "*Dhānukas*" and "*Goāras*" (Milkmen)—the cultured Śūdras of today—were ranked with the "*Dhanikāras*" (goldsmith), "*Camāras*" (shoe-makers), "*D'ova*" (sweepers)

1. VR. Intro. X ; HML. I, 121 ff; for Jyotirīśvara's age and identity see JBRS. XXXVII, pts. iii- iv, pp. 14- 24. The book is divided into seven chapters- (i) Nagara- varṇanā, (ii) Nāyaka-varṇanā (iii) Asthāna-varṇanā, (iv) Ṛtu-varṇanā, (v) Prayāṇaka-varṇanā, (vi) Bhaṭṭādi-varṇanā and (vii) Kalā-varṇanā.
2. Ibid, intro. XX.
3. VR. p. 6 : " चोर , चंचल, जुआर, छिनार, लगवार, पेटकट, नाकट, कनकट, अनेक जे असदर्थ अनुचीती ताकर आश्रय .."

etc., *i. e.*, the "*Mandajātīyas*" or depressed classes[1]. Above all, the Brāhmaṇas were the dominating factor. Their pleasure or displeasure could always account for anybody's "elevation" or "degradation", for the kings were all kind to the Brāhmaṇas (*Brāhmaṇeṣu kṣamī*)[2]. The streets were full of beggars like "*jogā*", "*yogī*", and "*bhaṇḍuās*" (sages, agents of prostitutes, etc.)[3]. Thus, seven hundred years ago the beggar-sages were ranked with the agents of prostitutes, as they are being done today. The untouchables like the Śūdras constituted the lowest grade in the society whose shadow was enough to contaminate a Brāhmaṇa. Their entry on particular thoroughfares was strictly prohibited. Those, who caused harm to others (*parapīḍaka śaṭha*) were declared "*bhṛtyas*" by the king. Those, who seized the wealth of the cultivators, were deprived of all their belongings and, then exiled from the land[4]. This shows that the culprits were severely punished, even for the petty offences.

1. Ibid. p. 1 : "तापसि, तेलि, ताति, तिवर····· धाङ्गल, धाकल, धानुक, धोआर, धनिया, धल्किार डोंव,··· ढाढि··· चमार, गोआर ·· साव पटविआ ··· नागर प्रभृति मन्दजातीय" ; Also cf. JBRS. xxxvi, pts. iii-iv, pp. 180-81.
2. RR. p. 61.
3. VR. p. 2 : "जगा, योगी, नगारि, भरहर, भण्डुआ, चेंगा, चतरिआ···· महीर····वाहिलि, परभा प्रभृति ये अनेक भिषारि"
4. RR, 61 :

"राज्ञो हि रक्षाधिकृता: परस्वादायिन: शठा:
भृत्या भवन्ति प्रायेण तेभ्यो रक्षेदिमा: प्रजा:
ये कार्षिकेभ्योऽर्थमेवं गृह्णीयु: पापचेतस:
तेषां सर्वस्वमादाय राजा कुर्य्यात् प्रवासनम्"

As it is, Jyotirīśvara probably did not feel so much attracted to the rustic folk and their ways as to the cultured people. Though he describes the gambling-house, names of various objects and other articles[1], we have unfortunately no means of knowing whether his survey included life in the village as well. In his *Dhūrtta-samāgama* he has given us just the kind of a little description of the house of a prosperous former[2]. But, this is, just, by way of a passing reference.

Vidyāpati has also given a scintillating picture of the society. He says : "after the death of Ganesarāi (Ganeśvara) the barons turned cheats. Thieves got a free hand. Slaves overpowered their masters. Religion sank in vices. Work came to a stand-still. Highhandedness became the order of the day. There was none to discriminate good from evil. . . .People of high birth became beggars. Learned men as it were, disappeared. All the fine qualities of Tirhut were gone."[3] From this description it is clear that there was chaos and lawlessness in Tirhut for a long time.

1. VR. pp. 23-26.
2. "भअवं, पेक्ख पेक्ख, विहिद–भअवज्जण–मुण्ड–सरिच्छ–बहुअर–महिसी–खम्भ–सोहन्त–चउस्सालं, इदो तदो सञ्चरन्त–बाल–गोवच्छ–सोहिदं पोणुत्तुङ्गत्थणा–लसपरिक्खलन्त-मन्दसञ्चार-रमणिज्जावासपरिसर-सञ्चरन्त-चेडिआसमूहं कस्सवि महाधणस्स वासभअणं विलोईअदि (Act I). cf. VR intro. xxxv.
3. Kirttilatā (Ed. Saksena), pallava II, pp. 16-19 :

   "ठाकुर ठक भए गेल चोरें चपुरि घर लिज्झिअ
   दासे गोसाञा निगहिअ, धम्म गए धन्ध निमज्जिअ
   खल सज्जन परिभविञा कोइ नहिं होइ विचारक
   जाति अजाति विवाह अधम उत्तम कां पारक
   अक्खर–रस निहारि नहिं कइ कुल भमि भिक्खारि भेंउ
   तिरहुत्ति तिरोहित सब्बगुणे राए गएनेस जबे सग्ग गेंउ"

From the *Kirttilatā* it is crystal clear that the condition of the Hindus was most deplorable in Vidyāpati's time. There is sincerity and honesty in his description of Jaunpur "where Hindus and Turks live together, one reviling the religion of the other. There are money-changers, markets for the sale of Hindu-slaves, bows and arrows, female-slaves etc." "They are purchasing many and many slaves, and when Turks (Muhammadans) meet Turks, there are many *salāms*." Forced labour is also described. "When a powerful Muhammadan undertakes a journey he compels men to serve without payment. They fetch a Brāhmaṇa boy and place beef on his head; they lick out the caste-mark on his forehead and tear asunder his holy thread and ask him to mount a horse. They demolish temples and build mosques in its place. Even an ordinary Musalman beats Hindus wherever he finds them. It seems, they would devour the Hindus."[1] Vidyāpati's description thus gives a lively picture of the condition of the Hindus in general in medieval age.

RELIGION

In the sphere of religion the Maithilas were equally orthodox. The priestly and intellectual aristocracy was

1. Ibid. p. 44 :

"धरि आनए बाँभन बटुआ मथाँ चड़ावए गाइक चुड़आ
फोट चाट जनउ तोड़ उमर चढ़ावए चाह घोर
हिन्दु बोलि दुरहि निकार छोटेओ तुरका भभकी मार
हिन्दूहि गांट्टओ गिलिए हल तुरुक देखि होउ भान"

Also cf. pallava III-IV ; S. Jhā, The Songs of Vidyāpati, 21.

predominant. It set to itself to suppress any attempt at social or mutual emancipation outside its pale. Rigid rules for Śūdras and other than non-Brāhmaṇas were formulated and enforced. Elaborate treatises on religious rites, gifts, ritual for consecration of houses, temples, divine images, rules for performing *śrāddhas*, philosophy of the *Bhakti* doctrines and the duties enjoined to the followers of that doctrine, philosophical disquisition on sacrificial rites, religious duties of Śūdras and women were written mostly by the same law-givers[1].

The Maithilas were strong believers in *varṇāśrama dharma* and simple devotion to Hindu gods and deities. The three main figures, who have inspired and animated their souls throughout the ages, are *Śiva*, *Sakti*, and *Viṣṇu*. They valued them equally as capable of giving supernatural rewards. The three-fold marks (yet visible) on the forehead of the Maithilas represented the following symbols—the horizontal lines marked with ashes represented their devotion to Śiva ; the vertical sandal-paste in white represented their faith in Viṣṇu and the dot of sandal-paste in red or of vermillion represented their veneration for Śakti[2].

The worship of Śiva was, however most widespread among the men and women folks (especially the Brāhmaṇas). The popularity of full fasting on a *(Kṛṣṇapakṣa)* Caturdaśī ; the worship of lacs of clay made *Śiva-liṅgas* on special occasions ; the two kiuds of songs of Śiva—the *Nacārī* and *Maheśavāṇī* and the heaps of pure devotional hymns composed by poets—from Vidyāpati down to

1 Mitra, Notices, IV, Nos. 1830-31, 1839, 1841, 1856, 1874 etc.
2. HML. I. 19.

Candra Jhā—and Śiva temples in almost all the villages (even now) distinctly point to the great place that Śiva occupied (and occupies) in their hearts[1].

The worship of Śakti was no less popular. Śakti was supposed to give *siddhis* only but lord Śiva could award *mukti* or Salvation. Some of Mithilā's greatest saints and Upāsakas have been associated with Śakti, *e.g.*, Devāditya, Vardhamāna, Madana Upādhyāya and a host of *tāntrikas*[2]. The very first verse taught to a child was in praise of Śakti, *i.e.*, the popularity of *Aripaṇa* (or *Alipana* or painted *yantras* on the ground).

Moreover, the *Śābara* rites of Mithilā's women, the sensuous character of the people; *pāga* or their Tāntric headdress, the widespread worship of earthen images of *Durgā*; the *Mātṛkā pūjā* and the prevalence of *Dīkṣā* (*iṣṭamantragrahaṇa*) etc., strongly point to the great importance and ineffaceable impact of Śakti in Maithila religious life[3]. In this connection a particular point of interest is the establishment of the shrine of *Tulajā mātā* or *Tāleju mā*, a Śakti Goddess—held in high esteem by the Newāras (of Nepal)—who later became the titulary deity of the Malla (Newār) dynasty of Kāntipura (Kāṭhamāṇḍū) in the 17th century. "The Goddess was equally the especially

1. cf. Vaṭeśvara-sthāna Stone Inscription (found near the Colgong or Kahalgāon station on the East Indian Railway in the Bhagalpur district) which proves the antiquity of the god Vaṭeśvara (Siva) worshipped at Vāṭeśvara sthāna even up to the present day. (Vide—JBRS. xxxvii, pts. iii-iv, pp. 4-6).
2. cf. JBRS. xxxvii, pts. i-ii, pp. 123-24.
3. HML. I, 20 ff; also cf. The Khojpur Durgā Image Inscription (found in the village of Khojpur, in Darbhanga district), dated La. Saṃ. 147. (Vide—JBRS. xxxvii, pts. iii-iv, pp. 10-13).

worshipped deity of the Maithila (Karṇāṭa) dynasty started by Harisiṃha at Simrāon (c. 1326 A. D)." Furthermore, the *Ambā Bhavānī* of Tulajāpura in Hyderabad state is one of the most important Śākta shrines in the Deccan (and the great Śivājī, hero of Hindu national revival, was a devotee of this deity in the 17th century A. D.). "The institution of Deccan Brāhmaṇas (*Mahārāṣṭrīyas*) as priests in charge of Paśupatinātha was probably a direct result of the Karṇāṭaka connection[1]".

The proximity of the Śālagrāmī river, the observance of all principal Vaiṣṇava fasts and festivals and the immense popularity of Bhāgvata, Harivaṃśa and Brahmavaivarta Purāṇas prove the great infiuence exercised by Vaiṣṇava worship on the Maithila mind[2] The long and rich tradition of Maithilī love-poetry that found its greatest exponent in Vidyāpati is proudly associated with the great Vaiṣṇava literature. Śiva and Śakti were, however, predominant devotional mainsprings of the Maithila mind.[3]

Besides these three prominent cults worship of the Sun-cult seems to have been popular.[4] We have also mention of a different religious sect, *i. e.*, the *Tapasī*.[5] They have been stigmatised as "*Mandajatīya*" (low caste). They must have been, therefore, different from the adherents of "Śiva, Śakti and Viṣṇu." or, they were so called as they lived by begging because of their gruelling poverty.[6]

1 JRASB. XVI. pt. ii, p. 186.
2. cf. JBRS. XXXVII, pts. i-ii, pp. 123 24.
3. cf. Ibid. XXXIII. 52; HML. I. 20 ff.
4. cf. The Bhavāditya-temple of Narasiṃhadeva of Karṇāṭa dynasty in Kandahā, Bhagalpur.
5. VR. p. 1.
6. cf. JBRS. XXXVI, pts. iii-iv, p. 180

The traditional fight between the Buddhists and the Brāhmaṇas appears to have been the same as before. The Brāhmaṇas treated them, and not the Muslims, as their worst enemies even two hundred years after the destruction of Nālandā. Jyotirīśvara denounces them as "degraded and dangerous."[1] The story of the massacre of the Buddhists and their king Arjuna of Saptarī (Nepal) by the Dronavāra Maithila king Purāditya of Rāja Banauli after Śivasiṃha's death,[2] is a significant pointer to it. These references show the bitterness that the Brahmaṇas nourished against the Buddhists through centuries.

During the 13th and 14th centuries this predominantly Brāhmaṇical country faced the inroad of a new religion, *i.e.*, Islām, which the conquering Muslims had brought along with them. The legal writers and religious preachers asserted themselves and for long resisted its onrush. But in course of time, like the rest of India, they also appear to have compromised with the new religious force, for there are several features even now which show a complete fusion of Hindus and Muslims. The large number of Persian and and Arabic words used by the Maithilas; the deliverance of judgements in the courts of Mithilā in strict accordance with traditional Hindu manner, till as late as the 18th century A. D..[3] ; the respect of Maithilas for Muslim festivals (e.g., *Tazia-Dāhā* as the Maithilas call it) and

1. VR. 39 : " वोद्रपक्ष अइसन आपातभीषण, उदयनक सिद्धान्त अइसन प्रसन्न "
2. Mishra, Vidyāpati Thākura, 56-57; Sukumar Sen, Vidyāpati-Goṣṭhī 18; JASB. LXXII, pt. i, p. 27 ; Mitra—Majumdar, Vidyāpati, 17, fn. 46; also cf. the Vivāda-cintāmaṇi of Vācaspati Miśra, (trans. by Ganganath Jha), intro. ix-x.
3. Vide—K.P. Jayaswal on the Judgements of Sacala Miśra (JBORS. 1920).

the Muslims' reverence for Hindu festivals, the adoption of Faslī era (started by Akbar) as the National Maithila Era; the devotional songs sung in praise of Rāma and Kṛṣṇa both by Hindu and Muslim saints; the incorporation of Iman and Firadausī *rāgas* by the Maithila musician Locana, the celebrated author of *Rāgataraṅginī*, etc. in the following century are some of the examples which strongly support the above contention.

EDUCATION

The rule of the Karṇāṭa and Oinavāra dynasties left their ineffaceable marks on Sansksrit learning. Books and commentaries and digests on almost all the branches of literature and science were either written or compiled. Smṛtic studies in particular found a great impetus in this period. They were renewed and considerably developed by Caṇḍeśvara and his family and such other notables as Śrīdattopādhyāya, Harināthopādhyāya, Bhavaśarman, Indrapati and his pupil, Lakṣmīpati.[1]

An important school of Grammar was started by Padmanābha Datta with his "*Supadma*" and its various supplements. On Rhetoric and Erotic some of the most popular books were written by Bhānudatta Miśra. Ratneśvara commented upon the *Sarasvatī Kaṇṭhābharaṇa* in rhetorics, while in erotics Jyotirīśvara wrote the *Pañcaśāyaka* and *Raṅgaśekhara*, off-quoted in Medieval Sanskrit literature.[2] Among literary compositions Bhavadatta's commentary on the Epic-poem *Naiṣadha- caritam* is yet studied with great

1. JASB. 1915 (N.S.). p. 414.
2. Ibid. 414, fn. 3.

interest. Pṛthvīdhara Ācārya's commentary on the drama *Mṛcchakaṭika* written under the patronage of Rāmasiṃhadeva is still very popular in literary circles. Lexicon was also not neglected. Śrīkara Ācārya's commentary on the *Amarakoṣa* is a remarkable gem of Sanskrit literature. Jyotirīśvara deserves special mention for his composition of the earliest extant work in Maithilī *i. e.*, the *Varṇana-Ratnākara.* His period was indeed "the Golden Age of Sanskrit studies in Mithilā."[1]

The following period-the period of the Oinavāra Brāhmaṇas was the age of Turkish invasion. When, eventually the first flood of Muslim invasion, coming down the Gaṅgā, did overspread Bihar, it subsided leaving Mithilā with Hindu kings still holding courts where poetry and learning were alone honoured. Though no dominant figure is visible like Gaṅgeśa Upādhyāya in Nyāya, Caṇḍeśvara Thakkura in Smṛti, and Padmanābha Datta in Grammar, learning was spread among a large number of persons and the writers did not confine themselves to any particular branch. The four most important names during the rule of this dynasty are Jagaddhara, Vidyāpati, Śaṅkara Miśra, and Vācaspati Miśra.[2]

1. VR. int o. xx.
2. cf. The Vivāda-Cintāmaṇi of Vācaspati Miśra (Trans by Ganganath Jha), Intro. ix-xxiv. This Vācaspati (also known as Abhinava Vācaspati) should be distinguished from the great Vedantist philosopher Vācaspati Miśra, the celebrated author of Bhāmatī or Sub-Commentary on Saṅkara's Sārīrakabhāṣya and Nyāya-sucinibandha (898 A. D.).--Ibid, xxiv ; AIE 597; JASB. 1915 (N. S.), pp. 400, 431-32.

He should also be distinguished from a later Vācaspati—Candraśekhara Vācaspati of Varendra Brāhmaṇa family (Ibid. 400).

While the Kāmeśvara-period was made famous in the literary world by the erudite and versatile scholar Jagaddhara[1], the Mithilā of Śivasiṃha was illumined by the divine sparks of the celebrated poet Vidyāpati whose name has come down to the posterity in connection with Maithilī songs, as a house-hold word throughout the whole of Bihār and Bengal. Vidyāpati (born c. 1360 or c. 1340 A. D.) –the contemporary of Chaucer (born c. 1340 A.D.), the great English poet—was author of *Kirttilatā* and specially the anthology, *Padāvali*—songs that stirred up the later Vaiṣṇava writers and preachers of Bengal and reverberated like the enchanting heavenly music through the forests, rivers and dusty villages of Mithilā. He also wrote on Smṛti (*Vibhāga-sāra*, *Gangā-vākyāvali*, and *Dāna-vākyāvali*) ; on Nīti or moral tales (*Bhū-parikramaṇa*, and *Puruṣa-parīkṣā*) ; on Pūjā (*Saiva-sarvasva-sāra*, and *Durgā-bhakti-taranginī*), and on literary compositions (*Likhanāvali*)[2].

The days of Vidyāpati (c. 1340–1448 A. D.) were the days of the glory of Mithilā University. A scion of a distinguished family of scholars, a voluminous writer, a widely-read scholar and a Sanskrit poet of eminence, a charming lyric-poet and the first of old Vaiṣṇava master-singers, a general and an administrator, and the brightest jewel of Śivasiṃha's court, Vidyāpati overshadows all vernacular poets, even Caṇḍīdāsa "the child of nature"[3]. His short hymns of prayer and praise became great favourite of the modern Vaiṣṇava reformer of Bengal– Caitanyadeva,

1. AIE. 596 ; JASB. 1915 (N. S.), p. 431.
2. cf. HML. I, 134-46, 196 ff.
3. Sen, HBLL. I, pp. 140-4).

and through him his songs have become as well known in Bengalī house-holds as the Bible is in an English one[1]. He was thus a poet and finished scholar, whose similies and metaphors, choice of expressions, and the higher flight of imaginations are brilliant poetical feats which at once captivate the ear and dazzle the eyes. The scenes of sensuality and lust in his poems are a strange combination of holy and unholy, of earthly and heavenly. His earlier poems are full of sensualism, his later of mystic ideas[2].

Mithilā also made conspicuous contributions to the study of *Mīmāṃsā* of which there were two predominant schools—the Bhaṭṭa School and the Prabhākara School. She was a centre where its study reached the zenith. During the reign of Rānī Viśvāsa Devī, king Padmasiṃha's wife, there was a gathering of Paṇḍitas or scholars in Mithilā, in which some fourteen hundred Mīmāṃsakas alone were invited. But it appears that of these two Schools of Thoughts, the School of Prabhākara Miśra (or the Prabhākara School) became more and more popular, which attracted the attention of the scholars from different parts of the country[3]. She also developed a famous School of Nyāya which flourished from the twelfth to the fifteenth century A. D. under the great masters of logic—Gaṅgeśa, Vardhamāna, Pakṣadhara, and others[4]

1. Grierson, Introduction to Maithilī Language (Sec. on Vidyāpati).
2. HBLL. I, 149 ; HML. I, 130 ff.
3. Prabhākara-mīmāṃsā by Dr. Gaṅganātha Jhā, p. 10 ; Jha Com. Vol. 242-43.
4. AIE. 597.

Thus, during the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries a host of scholars kept up and illumined the literary activities of Mithilā, though the scholars named above "represent its highest level and achieved an all-India reputation and a permanent place in the realm af scholarship." Like Nālandā of former times Mithilā by her scholastic activities in those days attracted students from different parts of India for advanced and specialized studies in Nyāya or Logic of which she was then the chief centre. In fact the period will go down in the history of Indian literature as "The Golden Period," for it is marked out from the previous periods by the gradual diffusion of Sanskritic knowledge and by the first serious attempts in developing the vernacular literature[1].

A few words about the system of education at the Mithilā University. It is indeed interesting to note that "corresponding to the system of admission at Nālandā and Vikramaśilā by difficult examination by learned *Dvāra-Paṇḍitas*, Mithilā instituted a peculiar examination for graduation or completion in study".[2] It was known as "*śalakā-parīkṣā*", by which the candidate for graduation had to explain that page of a MS. which was pierced last by a needle run through it[3], and where the candidate was allowed even to have his books by his side when the experts took his vivavoce. This was the test of the capacity of the candidate "to explain unprepared any part of the text he

1. JASB. 1915 (N. S.), p. 432.
2. AIE. 598.
3. Vidyābhūṣaṇa, History of Indian Logic, 522, fn. 1; Gopinath Kavirāja, Sarasvatī Bhavana Studies, IV. p. 62.

had studied so as to demonstrate his mastery of the subjects in all its parts". Only then the diploma of the Mithilā University was conferred on the successful candidate. The system of taking a "*ṣaḍayantra*" was comparatively a much more difficult system, for in the latter case the scholar was even required to present himself for examination by the public. The scholar who intended to take a "*ṣaḍayantra*" could be asked any question on any topic that the people liked. It appears to have been a sort of Intelligence or General Knowledge Test by the public[1]. Similarly the institution of *Upādhyāya*, *Mahopādhyāya*, and *Mahāmahopādhyāya* was established "as graded degrees of seniority among Professors"[2]. These peculiar marks of Maithila culture are yet visible in various forms. Most of the Maithila place-names are commemorative of the particular branches of learning that have been perfected or specialised at those places—*viz.*, Yajuāḍa (seat of Yajurveda), Rāgā (seat of Rgveda), Atharī (seat of Atharvaveda), Mau-Behaṭa (seat of Mādhyandini śākhā), Bhaṭṭasimari or Bhaṭṭapura (seat of Bhaṭṭa School of Mīmāṃsā) & etc.[3]

No account of Maithila intellectual life can be said to be complete without some notices of the cultural relation that existed then between Mithilā and Bengal, for the Smṛtic writers of Mithilā considerably influenced and stimulated the later Smṛtic studies in Bengal. Vidyāpati's songs

1. Jayaswal's Introduction in Mithilā MSS. Cat. Vol. II ; R. Jhā, Twelfth All-India Oriental Conference (Banaras) Proc. Vol. I., pt. ii, pp. 310 & 325.
2. Dr. Ganganath Jha's Foreword to Keśī Miśra's edition of Mm. Sacala Miśra's Commentary on Aryasaptaśatī, p. 11.
3. JBRS. XXXIII, 47.

apart, the Nadiā University like the Mithilā University is a name to conjure with. During the reign-period (A. D. 1198–1757) of the Muslim rulers Nadiā "rose to be a great centre of Hindu learning known throughout India". The need for forming a new seat of learning, it is said, was created by the proud practice of Mithilā not to allow any one of its students to take from its schools or even notes of the lessons or lectures delivered there. Graduates were allowed only to leave with their diplomas but not with any Mss. The peculiar rule "confined the learning of Mithilā within its own limits and prevented its extension beyond them." This was indeed a challenge which was successfully answered by Raghunātha Śiromaṇi who first began by instituting a Chair of Logic in Nadiā and broke "the monopoly of Mithilā" in the teaching of that subject[1].

Along with the Chair of Logic, there was also at Nadiā a Chair of Smṛti which was inaugurated by Raghunandana, the most distinguished jurist of his time (16th century A. D.). In the field of Smṛti, Caṇḍeśvara, Harinātha Upādhyāya, Bhavaśarman, Indrapati, Padmanābha Datta. and others influenced the Smṛti-writers of Bengal[2]. This regular cultural flow between the two countries—Mithilā and Bengal for several centuries past – can be seen in their love for Sanskrit learning, similarities in customs and manners and the sameness of peculiarities which are characteristic of their social life.

Besides Bengal, there was also cultural relation between Mithilā and Nepal. As a matter of fact, during the early

1. AIE 600.
2. Ibid. 601.

days of Muslim occupation of Eastern India, many scholars afraid of Turkish persecution, fled to the Nepal region together with the books in their family-libraries[1]. The conquest of the Nepal valley by the Karṇāṭas gave further impetus to this growing cultural flow. A considerable degree of literary intercourse was going on between the two neighbouring countries. Accordingly a large number of the MSS. discovered in Nepal are written by Tirhuti (Maithila) scribes Sometimes the Maithila scribes settled down in Nepal. That a Nepalese scribe was also living in Tirhut is a "notice of far greater interest.. .a case of intercourse in the opposite direction".[2]

ART

Art was not neglected during the period. On the other hand, it was practised with great enthusiasm and sincere regard. But, of all arts—architecture, sculpture, painting, music, etc.—music appears to have been most popular with the kings as well as with the people. It was developed and patronised by the kings unceasingly. The first historical king of Mithilā, Nānyadeva himself seriously developed the popular rāgas in Mithilā. He was a prominent writer on music, which is evident from Sāraṅgadeva's *Sangīta Ratnākara*[3]. The colophons to the MS. of Bharata's

1. Wright, Nepal, 72 ; Bendall, Catalogue, p. xxii ; Banerji, Bāṅgālār Itihāsa, Vol. I, (2nd Ed.), p. 354 ; IHQ. xxx, 386.
2. C. Bendall, Historical Introduction to H. P. Sāstri's Catalogue, p. 18.
3. pp. 1-12.

Nāṭya-śāstra[1] clearly suggest that Nānya was author of *Sarasvatī-Hṛdayālankāra*[2]. Moreover, the inscription of Nānya mentions *Grantha-mahārṇava* as his book[3]. In his treatment of '*Jātis*' and '*Rāgas*' he has introduced much new matter, not found perhaps in Bharata and Abhinava-gupta. In all details he has treated at length 160 Rāgas. The elaborate details and the comprehensive presentation, generally free from errors, of all these rāgas in their varied forms elevate Nānya at once to the row of the master music-writers whom Sārangadeva quotes so profusely.[4]

The tradition established by Nānya was brilliantly kept up and followed by such great musicians as king Harisiṃhadeva, Kaviśekharācārya Jyotirīśvara (c. 1324 A.D .), Siṃha Bhūpāla Jagaddhara, Jagajjyoti Malla and later on Locana, the author of the famous *Rāgataranginī* (c. 1680 A. D.) and others. It was this unique development of music that gave Mithilā its great literature of Early Maithilī, especially the lyrics of Vidyāpati, Umāpati, and Govindadāsa. Moreover, it gave rise to a great cultural institution in Mithilā, i.e., the "*Kīrtaniyas*". In fact, one of the greatest contributions that Maithila culture has made to Indian culture is that "after the decline of the classical languages it was the first to give vernacular dignity of literary vehicle in the whole of Eastern Indian."[5]

1. Chaps. XXVIII-XXXIV.
2. QJAHRS. I, 56-58.
3. JBORS. IX. 303.
4. QJAHRS I, 62.
5. cf. VR. intro. xx-xxi. For the Maithila traditional music Nāradīya, and other relative influences in Nepal & Assam, see HML. I, 31-38.

As to the architectural aspect, construction of temples (or temple-building) seems to have been quite favourite with the kings. Temples were built by one and all kings on a gigantic scale. Dr. Spooner styles them as "Tirhut Types of Temples". In the simplest form in which this sort of temple could appear, in point of theory, we should have a small square room to contain the sacred image, with a more or less ordinary roof, sloped to keep the rain off, and in course of time, a narrow portico in front to keep the fierceness of the Sun from entering the shrine. There is nothing curvilinear about it, and such a primitive type of structure is remote from the Black Pagoda of Konarak. A perfectly plain, undecorated walls, and an equally undecorated painted roof, square in plan, is all that these Tirhut Types stand for.[1] The Hara Mandira at Bagadā (Campāran), the Kamaleśvaranātha temple at Triveṇī (Campāran), the Mahādevasthāna at Saurāṭha (Darbhanga), the Rāmacandra Mandira at Ahilyāsthāna at Ahīarī (in Darbhanga), the Bhagavatī Mandira at Subegarh (Muzaffarpur), the Kaṅkālī Devī temple at Simrāongarh in Nepalese territory, the Śiva Mandira at Sheohar (Muzaffarpur), the Rāma Mandira at Muzaffarpur (a perfect symbol of the developed *Navaratna* type), and another temple at Muzaffarpur to Rāma and Jānakī—"the utmost culmination of temple-architecture"—and others in the series so preserved at different places are sufficient to "illustrate the whole development of this important style—a series including many shrines of special interest and beauty."[2]

1. JBORS. II. 121.
2. For an elaborate discussion, see Ibid II. 121-34.

Construction of palaces and buildings seems to have been undertaken only when the kings transferred their capitals. The ruins at Simrāongarh, the capital of the Karṇāṭa king Harisiṃhadeva, are evidently *disjecta membra* of the same magnificent body to which the mausoleum of Keśariā and the solitary columns of Maithiāh, of Rādhiāh and Bokhra belong. The remains of the palace, of the citadel and of the temple of titulary goddess exhibit finely carved stone-basements, with superstructures of the same beautifully moulded and polished bricks, for the temples and the palaces of the valley of Nepal are justly celebrated.[1] Apart from architectural magnificence we have also vivid glimpse into the sculptural brilliance that these ruins manifest. Some twenty idols, extricated, are made of stone and are superior in sculpture to modern specimens of the art. There are four or five pucca walls round each having a breast work about 3 ft. above the ground, similar precisely to the wells of the valley. Inscriptions or figures symbolising gods and goddesses, e. g., Viṣṇu, Śiva, Śakti, in a life—like manner, as are seen on the walls of the temples in the Andhrā-Thārhī village, are clear illustrations of the same sculptural brilliance. Moreover, the structure of the building discovered in course of Bhagīrathapura excavations[2] is a further illustration of the architectural development. Different types of ornamented and decorated big slabs were discovered. One peculiar brick had a betel-like design, and another had the design as it is found in the older Hindu

1. JASB. IV. 122-23.
2. JBRS. XL 347 ff.

temples. This shows that a fine art of workmanship on stones and bricks had developed in Mithilā in the early fifteenth century. A.D. The carved bricks in the second layer with the connected links indicate that "these three apartments were meant for special purposes and must have been put to use by important personalities. On few bricks it seems, there are specimens of some *tāntric cakras*".[1] Of the two slabs, the bigger one has a very carving and chiselling work. It was probably the upper portion of a stony wall which was supported by some pillars. There are straight carvings on these stones and it seems that this design was a continuous one. "The lower portion of the smaller stone-slab has ordinary decoration, but the upper left corner indicates that in the upper side it formed another beautiful artistic workmanship."[2]

PAINTING

Painting has been an inseparable aspect of Maithila cultural life. They are primarily wall-paintings. Archer styles them as "Maithila Painting," which, in its essentials, is the paintings of Maithila Brāhmaṇas and Maithila Kāyasthas. The instance of these paintings depends ultimately on the types of sensuality which they express. Besides wall-paintings, it has been the custom with the Kāyasthas to occasionally paint on paper, and both Brāhmaṇas and Kāyasthas to paint the pottery, fans, and earthen dishes

1. Ibid. 348.
2. Ibid. 348-49 ; The Indian Nation, Patna, dated Thursday, Nov. 25, 1954 (Dak Edition), p. 6.

used at marriages. But then, such painting has been entirely subsidiary to the wall painting. These paintings have always been temporary because of their dependence on walls, generally made of mud, which account for their fading away so soon, say, after five to six years. It is because of their temporary nature and sudden disappearance or washing away, due to the crumbling of walls, that we have hardly any segment of the wall paintings done during the period under review. The fact, however, remains that this act of painting has been carried on from times immemorial to the present day as part of the culture and as long as the culture persists there is no need for particular paintings to remain.[1] The paintings dissolve but the style goes on.

The most peculiar characteristic of the Maithila painting has been that the painting is done entirely by the household ladies as " an ordinary domestic art." On certain ceremonies paintings are required, and the women have been doing them as integral parts of the ritual. With the end of the ceremonies art lapsed, the house-hold tasks were resumed. With the recurring of the ritual the paintings would be resurrected, the "ordinary person would again become an artist" and again the paintings would boom on the wall. Thus linked to the ritual and domestic traditions of the area Maithila painting has been "as natural and as necessary as sweeping the courtyard or going to a well."[2]

The things essentially required for this process are - a suitable surface on the wall, the requisite paints and finally

1. Mārg (Ed. Mulkraj Anand), Vol. III. No. 3, p. 25.
2. Ibid. 25.

some brushes. The paints have a narrow range of colours, generally *gulābī* (pink), *pīta* (yellow), *nīla* (blue), *sindura* (red), and *suga-pankhī* (green). Colours and powders are mixed up with goat's milk, black is obtained by burning straw, and white by powdering rice and mixing it up with water. For outlines and tiny details a small bamboo-twig is used - the end being slightly frayed so that the fibre is like hair, while for putting on the larger washes a small piece of cloth is tied to a twig. These twigs, though strange to ears, can nevertheless "contribute effects as alert and nerved as those from the sable brushes of a European artist." No preliminary sketching is required and the outlines done in a single flow of the brush.

The subject matter-generally falls into two groups : (i) a series of heavenly forms to which are sometimes added the more mundane figures of the bride and bridegroom along with members of their wedding-train, and (ii) a series of strictly selected vagetable and animal forms. Paintings have been usually done on the occasions of sacred thread-ceremony, the dedication or the renovation of the family shrine, and two ceremonies of marriage—the initial wedding rites and the final rites

On the former two occasions the subject-matter is confined to gods and goddesses, depicting *Durgā*, *Kālī* *Rāma* and *Sītā*, *Rādhā*, and *Kṛṣṇa*, while at weddings (when painting is treated as essential) the following objects —the Sun and Moon, a bamboo-tree, a circle of lotuses, parrots, turtles and fish come into prominence. While the former is the symbol of the creation of auspicious scenes and divine blessings, the latter symbolised fertility. The bamboo-tree and the ring of lotuses represent the

diagrams of the sexual organs; parrots symbolise the love bird; turtles diagrammatise the lovers' union and fishes the emblems of fertility, and the Sun and the Moon symbolise the life-giving qualities. The supernatural colour and splendour in a figure, which is hardly seen in ordinary life, is partly dictated by religious canons For example, the figure of Kṛṣṇa is often "the black just as in Christian art the robe of the Virgin Mary is normally blue."[1]

In the Kāyastha painting we have again and again only two shades—black and a stale blood red colour, sometimes a dull terracotta colour and sometimes a dark madder colour. At times blue, grey, pink and yellow colours are also used. Considering the various effects of these different colours, when used combinedly, it can be said that "the colours of Brāhmaṇa paintings are parallel to those in paintings by Miro, while those of Kāyastha paintings resemble the black and terracotta colours of Greek Vases."[2] But, the interesting difference between these two styles of painting is that while the Brāhmaṇa paintings bear "thin, wavering and nervous" lines, the Kāyastha paintings have "firm, vigorous and precise" lines. The forms in the latter are "agile and vital," in the former "never in motion" but always "delicate and fantastic." Rhythm, the most important quality in Kāyastha paintings is "casual and accidental" in Brāhmaṇa paintings. As a result, the Kāyastha painting on the wall "becomes a series of neatly regulated panels" - the vitality of each image being as it were subdued into "single central energi-

1. Ibid 27-29, 31-32.
2. Ibid 33.

sing force." An inescapable element of strangeness, the sense of a novel wonder, a mystery burning at the heart of life are some of the intrinsic characteristics of the best art and it is "this strangeness, this incandescence which, above all, the painting of Mithilā transmits."[1]

1. Ibid. 33.

CHAPTER VIII

THE AGE OF THE MUSLIM CONQUEST

(1200 A. D. – 1556 A. D.)

The Muslim conquest of Bengal in the beginning of the thirteenth century was the first wave of aggressive imperialism that "revived the dying energies of Islam which had been losing force in India ever since the death of Sultan Mahmud Ghazanavi"[1]. The inflow of war-like peoples permanently affected the political destiny of India. "Its first rush did not stop till Muhammad Bakhtyār Khilji carried the victorious banner of Islam further eastward into South Bihar, and soon after planted it triumphantly on the banks of the Bhāgīrathī and the Karatoyā"[2]. As a result of their successive raids Northern India came to be colonized by the Muslim conquerors in the thirteenth century A.D. The subjugation of whole of North Bihar is a point of controversy. Some scholars believe that "the eastward expansion of the Muslim power was at this time barred by the powerful Hindu Kingdom of Mithilā" under the Karṇāṭa dynasty. The momentum of the Muslim offensive under the leadership of Muhammad Bakhtyār, therefore, acquired a greater driving force in South Bihar[3].

Others believe that the Muhammadan conquest did not reach far north of the Gaṅgā, for "it is not till the time of

1. HB. II, p. 1.
2. Ibid. 1.
3. Ibid. 2.

Ghias-ud-din 'Iwaz, the Muhammadan conqueror of Bengal between 1211 and 1226 A. D. that we learn that he carried the banner of Islam into the territories of the Rājā of Tirhut, which had never been subdued, and compelled him to pay tribute."[1] Kānungo says that Muhammad Bakhtyār invaded Bengal under Lakṣmaṇasena and Nawadwip was sacked. The object behind Bakhtyār's raids was to secure a maximum of booty at the least risk and bloodshed. This led him to scour the open country undefended by the field army of any organized State. For a year or two he plundered the Hindu territory of Bengal and made a sudden dash for "the fortress of Bihar", including Vikramaśilā in the Bhagalpur division. The fortress was captured and all its inhabitants, mostly shaven-headed monks possessing "much wealth and more books" were put to the sword (1199 A. D.). As it was a *vihāra* or *madrasā*, the Muslims named the whole country 'Bihar'. The fortified monastery was known as '*Audanḍa-Vihāra*' or *Odanḍapura* or *Odanḍapura vihāra*[2]. Again in 1200 A. D. he led his army in the direction of Bihar and was busy with consolidating his away over the province "by establishing thanas or military out-posts and by introducing administrative arrangements."[3] Bakhtyār was later assigned the viceroyalty of the provinces of Bihar and Lakhnauti by Sultan Qutbuddin Aibaka, the Sultan of Delhi.[4]

1. MDG. 17.
2. HB. II. 3 ; RS. 61-62, 64, fn. 1 & 7.
3. HB. II. 3.
4. RS. 59 ; TA. I. 50.

Strategically, Bengal costituted a significant point against any land-attack. North of this point it was very easy for armies to march from Bengal towards Tirhut and Oudh along the northern bank of the Gaṅgā, crossing the Kośī and the Gaṇḍaka at some convenient ford. "Hence the name of the 'Gateway of Bengal' (Darbhanga) given to the Tirhut district."[1] According to Kānungo, it still remains a "riddle in history" as to why Muhammad Bakhtyār, the conqueror of Gour (Gauḍa), undertook his Tibetan expedition "when the kingdom of Kamrup only on the other bank of the river Tistā-Karatoyā on his right flank and the kingdom of Mithilā between the Kośī and the Gaṇḍaka to his left lay unsubdued." Moreover, the Sena power of Vikrampura and the Eastern Gaṅga empire of Orissa in his rear were more dangerous to his far-flung possessions in Bihar and Bengal.[2]

From the accounts of the contemporary Muslim historians it is, however, clear that the first Muslim attack on Mithilā or Tirhut took place in 599.A.H. (1203 A.D.) by Muhammad Bakhtyār. We are told that he not only conquered but annexed Mithilā, atleast its south-eastern parts, to his newly acquired kingdom.[3] It was only after the

1. HB. II. 5, 13, fn. 2.
2. Ibid. 9.
3. It is said that before the Muhammadan conquest Bengal was divided into five regions : (i) Rāḍha, the country west of the Hughli and south of the Gaṅgā ; (ii) Bāgdī, the deltā of the Gaṅgā and the Brahmaputra ; (iii) Baṅg, the country to the east of the deltā ; (iv) Bārendra, the country to the north of the Padmā and between the Karatoyā and Mahānandā rivers and (v) Mithilā, the country west of the Mahānandā.

conquest of Tirhut that he captured the city of Gaur and occupied North Bengal of Varendra (Oct.1201—Jan. 1203). During this time Narasiṃhadeva of the Karṇāṭā dynasty was the ruler of Mithilā. Gulam Hussain Salim, however believes that "when Bakhtyār Khilji with 18 troops stormed Nadiā and conquered Bengal in 1198 A.D. (594 A.H.), he appears to have conquered Mithilā, Varendra, Rāḍha and the north-western portion of Bāgdi."[1] Sultan Qutbuddin Aibak, formerly viceroy of Shahabuddin Ghori, was on the throne of Delhi during this time. According to some scholars Narasiṃha submitted and agreed to pay tribute to the Muslim ruler which he continued till the time of Ghia-su-ddin ·Iwas.[2] The contemporary or the later Muslim historians, however, do not mention the name of the king who met such fate at the hands of Bakhtyār Khilji.

After Bakhtyār Bihar seems to have passed silently under Qutbuddin Aibak,[3] successor of Shahabuddin Ghori. Bakhtyār's disastrous Tibetan expedition deeply affected the subsequent course of the history of Bengal for half a century. "The Hindu powers found a respite and longer lease of life; severe losses in man-power arrested the expansion of the Muslim principality; Bihar from which Bakhtyār had drawn a larger number of troops for

Bakhtyār took possession of the south-eastern parts of Mithilā, Bārendra, the northern districts of Rāḍha and the north-eastern districts of Bāgdī. The Muhammadan province and kingdom of Bengal was long confined to this territory which was commonly known from the name of its capital, as Lakhanāwatī. (CHI. III. 260).

1. RS. 46, fn. 2 ; Rahmani, Op. Cit. 2nd Feb. 1953, p. 6.
2. Rahmani, Op. Cit. 6 ; cf. **Supra**, 266 ff ; Annals, xxxv, 107-08.
3. HB. II, 15,

this expedition was ultimately lost to Bengal. Demoralisation siezed the Khiljis; treachery and dissensions became rife in the land when luck deserted Bakhtyār."[1] He was later murdered by Ali Mardān Khilji in 602 A.H. or 1205 A.D.

We are also told that Ikhtiyār-ud-din Muhammad, son of Bakhtyār received some fiefs between the Gaṅgā and the Son (Oudh). "From this advanced base he led raids into Bihar and Tirhut, and took so much booty that large numbers of his own tribe, eager to serve under so fortunate a leader, joined him."[2] Thereupon he invaded Bihar and took its capital, Odaṇḍapura. He put to death the Buddhist monks who dwelt in its great monastery. He then returned with this plunder which included the library of the monastery, and made his obeisance to Qutbuddin Aibak, now the emperor of Delhi. We have, however, no further information as to his exploits.

Ali Mardān now styled himself as Sultan Alauddin. We have no direct evidence about the extent of his possession at the time of his death. This can, however, be said that during his time Bihar (at least east of the river Son) had been annexed to the Sultanate of Lakhanawati. This is proved by the fact that "the next ruler Husām-ud-din 'Iwaz is found in undisturbed possession of it till the first expedition of Iltutmish (1225-26 A.D.)."[3] Minhaj also does not say that 'Iwaz conquered that province after his accession. In about 1211 A.D., besides the Hindu rulers of Kamrup and Bang who paid tribute, the Hindu kingdom

1. Ibid. 11.
2. CHI. III. 42.
HB. II. 20, fn. 1.

of Tirhut also suffered similarly both at the hands of Muslim governor on one side and the ruler af Lakhanawati on the other.[1]

The rulers of "Bang, Kamrup and Tirhut" are, however, said to have paid tribute to Sultan Ghyāsuddin 'Iwaz Khilji (c. 1213-1227 A.D.—A.H. 610-624).[2] But we have no further information about the Muslim inroads into these countries which nodoubt suffered at the hands of Iwaz For a period of 12 years (610-622 A.H.) the Sultan of Lakhanawati was left undisturbed by Iltutmish. During this period "the sword of Iwaz did not certainly rust in the scabbord when the weakness and wealth of the neighbouring Hindu rulers offered opportunity for aggression." K.R. Kānungo remarks, "the old Karṇāṭaka kingdom of Mithilā was about this time breaking into fragments after the death of Arimalladeva and these princes in despair of holding their possessions in the plains hemmed in between the Muslim province of Oudh on one side and the territory of Lakhanawati on the other were seeking compensation in the valley of Nepal. The ruler of eastern Tirhut could not but come within the spheres of influence of Lakhanawati."[3]

Now, this statement of Kānungo is confused for he does not make it clear as to who this Arimalladeva was. Narasiṃhadeva ruled Mithilā during this period (1213-1227 A.D.). No such king as Arimalladeva ever ruled Mithilā. He was a ruler of Nepal. It is true that the Nepalese chronicle

1. Ibid.
2. TA. I, 59, 66.
3. HB. II. 22-23; cf. **Supra**, 268, fn. 2.

mentions Mall family as ruling in Tirhut before and after Nānyadeva, the founder of the Karṇāṭa dynasty. But the Mallas of Nepal also traced their descent from Nānyadeva. Arimalladeva, the ruler of Nepal may, therefore be called Karṇāṭaka. Sylvain Levi also thinks that a Malla dynasty in a part of Mithilā may have existed.[1] It is thus clear that Kānungo has confused this Arimalladeva with the Karṇāṭaka king of Mithilā who was no other than Narasiṃhadeva ruling over Mithilā during the period under review.

The fact, however, stands undisputed that the avalanche of Muslim inroads had already started in north-eastern India, and the Muslims had conquered territories as far as Bengal. Eastern part of Mithilā (Purnea) was also under the domination of Muslims.[2]

Sultan Ghyāsuddin Khilji proved a vigorous and benificent ruler. Under him the kingdom of Lakhanawati and Bihar enjoyed uninterrupted peace for about 12 years. But, the first expedition of Sultan Shamsuddin Iltutmish against Bengal in 622 A. H. (1225 A.D.) broke that peace. Meanwhile Sultan Ghyāsuddin had extended and consolidated the Muslim sovereignty in Bengal and besides Jajnagar (Orissa), Bang (East Bengal), and Kamrup (Western Assam) he had also extended his sway over Tihrut[3] under Narasiṃhadeva who paid him tribute. This fame and consolidation of power was enough to enrage the Emperor who lost no time in invading Bengal. Forces

1. Le Nepal, II, 210-13; Annals, XXXV, 108-09.
2. HB. II. 2; Also cf. RS. 47, fn ; Annals, xxxv. 109; cf. **Supra**, 272 ff..
3. RS. 70, fn. 2; MDG 17.

were sent against Bihar to wrest it from Sultan Ghyāsud-din Khilji. The Sultan himself appeared on the scene with an army to conquer Bihar and Bengal from 'Iwaz in 622 A. H. After a few skirmishes peace was concluded.[1] Emperor Iltutmish separated Bihar from the Bengal or Lakhanawati viceroyalty in 622 A.H. and placed Alauddin Jani in charge of the province of Bihar. After the departure of the Emperor for Delhi, Ghyāsuddin 'Iwaz expelled Alauddin and annexed Bihar to the Bengal viceroyalty.[2] It contineud to be a part of Bengal Kingdom till 1320 A. D. when Emperor Ghyāsuddin Tughlak again separated it.

The expulsion of Alauddin Jani from Bihar and its re-annexation to Bengal by 'Iwaz evoked the wrath of Iltutmish's son, Nasiruddin who invaded Lakhanawati and killed him and governed Bengal.[3] Thus within Bengal proper the Sultanate of Iwaz consisted of sircars Lakhana-wati, Purnea, Tajpur & etc. He re-annexed South Bihar and pushed his frontier up to that of the Delhi province of Oudh as far as the mouth of the Gaṇḍaka in North Bihar.[4] As a matter of fact "Musalman Bengal Kingdom in pre-Mughal times included for the most part the whole of North Bihar, and under several Musalman Bengal rulers also South Bihar as far westward as sircars Monghyr and Bihar, besides Orissa."[5]

1. Ibid ; HB. II. 26-27.
2. TN. (Pers. Text.) 163; RS. 59, fn. 1.
3. RS. 70, fn. 2; TA. I. 59, 66; HB. II. 27.
4. Ibid. 29, 31.
5. RS. 49, fn. 19; 59, fn. 1; Tarikh-i-.Firozshāhī, 451 & 586.

Muhammad Ilyas Rahmani says that Narasiṃhadeva of Mithilā helped Ghyāsuddin 'Iwaz in conquering Bihar. When Nasiruddin invaded Bengal, Iwaz was killed. Narasiṃhadeva submitted and agreed to pay tribute.[1] We, however, know that Narasiṃhadeva maintained his independent status. It was rather a successful invasion than an effectual conquest of the country, for the Karṇāṭa dynasty was about this time well established in Simrāon in Champaran district.

During the time of Sultan Iltutmish, Tughral Tughān was transferred from Badaun to Bihar. The province of Bihar did not include Tirhut then. It was a separate principality under the Karṇāṭas of Mithilā. After his appointment Malik 'Izzuddin Tughral Tughān started on his grand expedition in the beginning of 640 A. H. (c Sept. 1242 A. D.) shortly after the accession of Alauddin Ma'sud Shah on the throne of Delhi (20th May, 1242). Tughral Tughān enjoyed a fairly long lease of power for about nine years (1236—45 A. D.). A usurper he, however, legalised his status as the ruler of Bihar and Lakhanawati by procuring from Sultan Raziah Begum a formal recognition.[2] It is said that the Rājā of Tirhut raised the banner of revolt against the Delhi crown. Tughral Khan, thereupon marched against the Rājā, imprisoned him and took much booty. Rahmani says that the captive rājā (Narasiṃhadeva) fought bravely in behalf of Alauddin Ma'sud against Changiz Khan 642 A. H. (1244 A.D.) when the latter invaded Bengal. Alauddin was much

1. Op. Cit. 6; Annals xxxv. 110; **Supra**, 276, fn. 1 & 3.
2. HB. II. 46.

pleased with his acts of heroism and rewarded him with the kingdom of Mithilā. He was also ordered to pay tax direct to the Imperial Treasury.[1]

Minhaj also refers to Tughral's invasion in his *Tabaqat-i-Nasiri*, but makes no mention of the king. Ghulam Hussain Salim also makes no reference to this episode. He says, "during the time of Empress Raziah Izzuddin Tughral Khan proceeded from Lakhanawati to Tirhut district and acquired much booty and treasure (c. 641 A. H.)."[2] We have, therefore, no reference to the Maithila king's revolt in the accounts of the contemporary Muslim historians. Moreover, the year of Tughral's invasion clearly shows that it was not Narasiṃhadeva, but Rāmasiṃhadeva who was then on the throne of Mithilā.[3] Tughral's invasion was not the result of the Imperial command. It was the general trend of the forceful policy of aggression of the Muslim conquerors of the time. He was no exception to this. He speedily followed this policy, and the Delhi Sultan was too weak to arrest his aggressive march. "He started with a successful raid into the kingdom of Tirhut which yielded him much booty but no submission. He, however, did not employ his vast military resources in extending the boundary of Muslim dominion in Bengal which remained stationary since the death of Sultan Ghyāsuddin 'Iwaz."[4] The statement explicitly shows that the Karṇāṭas of

1. Rahmani, op. cit. 6.
2. RS. 74, fn. 1; Annals, xxxv. 112. fn. 1.
3. Cf. **Supra** 270 ff.
4. HB. II. 46, 76.

Mithilā still maintained their independence inspite of the devastating raids and indiscriminate plunder by the Muhammadan raiders.

All was not well with the court of Delhi during this period. Intrigues and revolutions were the daily occurrence. By this time there took place another ministerial revolution which brought back Balban to power. This emboldened Sultan Mughisuddin Yuzbak to sieze the masterless province of Oudh. During this campaign in the beginning of 654 A. H. (Feb. 1256 A. D.), Balban had driven out its rebellious governor Malik Mas'ud Jani and harried the province as far as Tirhut. Later Mughisuddin assumed independence at Lakhanawati and also took possession of Bihar and Oudh. He, however, met with his tragic end in Kamrup in 1257 A. D.

From the Bārahdāri Inscription of Bihar[1] we learn that Tājuddin Ārslān Khan held independent sway over Bihar and Lakhanawati under the title of Sultan and he died on the 8th March, 1265 A. D. His son was Tātār Khan who also died in independence, probably two years after Balban's accession. It was only after his death that Lakhanawati again became a province of the Delhi Empire. The Monghyr Inscription of Balban[2] (dated 677 A. H.) shows that Balban now separated Bihar from Bengal and placed it under an imperial officer. Bihar remained royal to Delhi even when Bengal was afterwards lost to the Empire.

1. JASB. 1873. p. 247; Epigraphia Indo-Moslemica, 1913-14. p. 24.
2. Beng. List. p. 414 ; Epigraphia Indo-Moslemica, 1909-10, p. 113.

After dealing with the Mongol invasion in the Panjab Sultan Ghiyāsuddin Balban wanted Sultan Mughisuddin Tughral of Bengal to pay him homage. But the latter replied to the Sultan's *farman* by mobilising his army and advancing into Bihar. He assumed the title of Sultan, and issued coins and read *khutba* in his own name.[1] In January 1278 A. D. Balban started against him. After crossing the river Sarayū the Imperialists advanced by way of Tirhut. Their progress was, however, arrested by the Bengal army somewhere between Tirhut and Lakhanawati. The two forces met each other but the Imperialists were badly defeated and helplessly plundered by the Hindus.

Again in c. 677 A. H. (1279 A.D.) another army was sent under Malik Bahadur (alias Malik Shihabuddin, Governor of Oudh) from Delhi. He also took the same road to Lakhanauti by way of Tirhut. This time again the Imperialists were badly discomfited. And now, Balban started in person. This time, however, luck deserted Sultan Mughisuddin Tughral who was defeated and killed.[2] Thus for several years, Tirhut was the scene of the advancing armies and the retreating forces.

Balban's son and successor Sultan Nāsiruddin Bughra Khan entered Bihar in February 1286 A.D. with a large army to punish his rebellious son, Sultan Kaiqubad or Kai-kaus (alias Rukn-ud-din). Nāsiruddin retained the province of Bihar and appointed Firuz Aitigin, the Royal (Balbani ?) Mamluk as its governor.

1. HB. II. 60.
2 Ibid. 67 ; also cf. Garh-Mukteshwar Mosque Inscription in Epigraphia Indo-Moslemica, 1913-14, p. 29.

Sultan Ruknuddin Kaikaus (c. 690–701 A. H. or 1291–1301 A. D.) was acknowledged as the suzerain of Bihar and Bengal for at least 8 years, if not longer. This is proved beyond doubt by the uninterrupted coinage of Kaikaus from the Lakhanawati mint down to 698 A.H. (*i. e.* 690-698 A. H.), and the three inscriptions[1] covering the same period. His reign in Bengal synchronises roughly with the reign of Jalaluddin Khilji and the early years of Alauddin's reign.

Firuz Aitigin (alias Sultan Shamsuddin Feroz Shah) seized the government of Lakhanawati after the death of Kaikaus. He entrusted the government of Bihar to his son Tāzuddin Hātim Khan and transferred his loyal servant Ziāuddin Ulugh Khan from Munger to Sātgāon. He vigorously resumed the war against the Hindu chiefs of the neighbourhood[2]. Shamsuddin Feroz reigned peacefully till 707 A. H. over *the whole of Bihar*, Lakhanawati, Sātgāon and Bang (Sonārgāon).[3] We have, however, no clear reference to his raid on or fight against the Maithila king.

The reign of Harisiṃhadeva, the last celebrated king of the Karṇāṭa line, faced the fresh inroads of the Muslim invasion. The introductory verse to the *Sugati-sopāna*[4]

1. (i) The Lakhisarai (Munger district) inscription, dated 697 A. H. (Oct. 1297 A. D.) ; (ii) The Devkot Inscription, dated 697 A. H. and (iii) the Tribenī (Sātgaon) Inscription dated 698 A. H. (Vide—Epigraphia Indo-Moslemica, 1917-18, pp. 10-15 ; JASB. 1873, pp. 246-47).
2. HB. II. 77-78.
3. Ibid. 80-81.
4. Intro. Verse 4.

gives us a poignant picture of the chaotic condition of the time. A verse in the *Dāna-ratnākara* says that Mithilā was sinking in the ocean of the Mlecchas[1]. Both Caṇḍeśvara and Jyotirīśvara[2] confirm that Harisiṃha defeated some Muslim king. He was able to recover his kingdom from the usurper as the composition of the *Dāna-ratnākara* and *Dhūrtta-samāgama* took place only after the expulsion of the said invader. This king was probably the king of Bengal—Bahadur Shah, for it is said that at the instigation of Bughra Shah, the eldest son of Feroz Shah and the brother of Ruknuddin and his brother Nasiruddin (who took refuge with Emperor Tughlak Shah in 1320 A. D. after having been defeated by his brother Bahadur Shah), Emperor Tughlak Shah or Sultan Ghyāsuddin Tughlak Shah invaded Bengal. When the Imperial army left Delhi, Bahadur Shah returned to Sonārgāon whilst Nasiruddin joined the Emperor at Tirhut, submitted to him and went to Lakhanawati where he was confirmed as the governor of Lakhanawati by the Emperor[3]. It was only after the extinction of Bahadur Shah (724 A. H.) that Ghyāsuddin Tughlak invaded Tirhut (1324 A. D.)[4]. This expedition of Ghyāsuddin Tughlak

1. Mitra, Notices. VI. 135, No. 2069 ; cf. **Supra**, 283, fn. 3.
2. Nepal Durbār Cat. p. 66 : "नानायोध निरुद्ध ··· न्यम्ताङ्घिपङ्केरुहः"
3. RS. 84. fn. 1 and 91-92 ; RR. 18 ; HB II. 84 ; Annals xxxv, pp. 115-16 ; Singh, 67, 85 ; CHI. III. 133-34 ; MDG. 18-19 ; TA. I. 213.
4. Rahmani's assertion that Ghyāsuddin attacked Harisiṃha because the latter helped Bahādur Shah against the Emperor is absurd and lacks support in contemporary accounts (cf. Op. Cit. p. 6.).

is a significant historical event which has been recorded by all the contemporary Muslim historians. He started on his fateful eastward march in the beginning of 724 A. H. (January 1324 A. D.) with the object of conquering Tirhut and Bengal. Harisiṃha put up a stubborn resistance and fought bravely against the imperialists but luck deserted him. He was completely defeated and the fort of Tirhut was stormed. He fled to Nepal, conquered the valley and settled down there[1]. With his flight the " last semblance of Hindu independence in Mithilā under the Karṇāṭa dynasty vanished and Tirhut became a mint-town of the Tughlak empire under the name Tughlakpur *urf* Tirhut)."[2]

Thus a new chapter was opened in the history of Mithilā with the retreat of Harisiṃha to Nepal. Ghyāsuddin Tughlak separated Bihar from Bengal[3] and Tirhut was formed into a separate province of which Darbhanga was made capital under the name of *Tughlakpur.* A fort and a *Jāmā Masjid* were also constructed under the Imperial order.

1. cf. **Supra**, 284 ff. ; RS. 91 fn. ; Briggs, I, 406-07 ; Thomas, Chronicles of Pathan Kings of Delhi, 8, 183, 194, 199 ; JRAS. IV. 124 ; IA. XIII, 414 ; Ain-i-Tirhut, 13 ; Tarikh-i-Firozshahi (Elliot, III. 234-40 & chap. x); Annals, xxxv. 117.

   Rahmani's interesting story about Vīreśvara regarding the miraculous stone-piece, Muhammad Tughlak's farman & etc. read more like fairy-tales than a piece of sober history. Nowhere does this find support in the accounts of the contemporary historians (Op. Cit. p. 6.).

2. HB. II. 84 ; cf. **Supra**, 281 ff, 290 ff.

3. RS. 84, fn. 3.

After a period of 225 years of independence and peace Mithilā once more witnessed the scene of chaos and depredations. Darbhanga became the seat of the Muhammadan governors who were appointed by the Delhi Emperor to establish order and exact tribute. In 741 A. H. (1340 A. D. or 1353 A. D.) the kingdom of Mithilā was given to Kāmeśvara Thākura, who founded the Thākura or Oinavāra dynasty which ruled over the land for about two centuries till the middle of the 16th cent. A. D.[1]. It is said that Muhammad Tughlak entrusted to Haji Ilyas Shah or Shamsuddin Ilyas Shah, the king of Bengal (743 A. H. or 1342 A. D.) to exact tribute from the new king and keep a vigilant eye on his movements.[2]

The accession of Shamsuddin Haji Ilyas Shah on the throne of Bengal (1342-1357 A. D.) is important. The whole of northern India was at that time in a state of turmoil owing to the violence and the caprice of the Delhi Emperor, Muhammad bin Tughlak. The Hindu chiefs to the east of Allahabad and Bahraich *i.e.*, the Rājās of Gorakhpur, Campāran[3] and Tirhut had thrown off their allegiance and become practically independent[4]. But there was no unity among them. " The extinction of the Delhi Sultan's authority and the absence of union among the Hindu Rājās encouraged Ilyas Shah to turn his arm against the West, and the first kingdom to feel the weight of his arm was Tirhut."[5]

1. Barni's Tarikh-i-Firozshahi (Elliot. III. 234-50 ; cf. Account of the Sugaunā dynasty of Kāmeśvara, chap. x) ; Singh, 85.
2. cf **Supra**, 290 ff.
3. Champaran though always an integral part of Tirhut seems to have been separated by this time.
4. HB. II. 103.
5. Ibid.

Tirhut during this time seems to have been divided between the two rival kings. The successors of Harisiṃha held their court at Simrāon, and Kāmeśvara, the nominee of Ghyāsuddin Tughlak at Sugaunā near Madhubani in Darbhanga district. It was thus torn between internal discord. Ilyas had, therefore, no difficulty in conquering this kingdom in 1345 A. D.[1]

The subjugation of Tirhut naturally emboldened Ilyas who made "a very daring incursion into Nepal in 1346 A. D." He marched to the city of Kāṭhamāṇḍū, "burnt and destroyed the holy *Svayambhūnātha Stūpa* and the sacred standard of *Śākyamuni*".[2] He, however, did not stay long in the capital. He also extended his arms beyond Tirhut to Campāran and Gorakhpur whose rājās transferred their allegiance to him.

Haji Ilyas is said to have divided Tirhut into two parts and fixed Būḍhī Gaṇḍaka as the dividing boundary line. Kāmeśvara objected to this division, but he was terrorised into silence. Ilyas now controlled the area from Nepal Terāi to Begusarai. On the bank of the Gaṇḍaka he founded a city, *Samsuddinpur*, now known as Samastipur. He founded the city of Hajipur (named after himself) at the confluence of the Gaṇḍaka and the Gaṅgā. Hajipur was long the headquarters of the governors of the Bengal kings[3].

1. Ibid. 103-04 ; CHI. III. 176 ; Annals, xxxv. 120 : RS. 100 fn. 3.
2. JBORS. 1936, pp. 81-91 ; HB. II. 104 ; Regmi, Ancient & Medieval Nepal. 153-54.
3. MDG. 20 ; cf. Rahmani's article in "Mithila" dated 16th Feb. '53 (Darb.), p. 6 ; Annals xxxv. 12o.

The startling victory of Haji Ilyas and his dash for supremacy opened the eyes of Sultan Firoz Tughlak who soon realised its grave political implications. His object was to punish Haji Ilyas and restore the territories bordering on the frontier between the Bengal kingdom and the Delhi Empire *i.e.*, from Oudh to Kośī, which were sacked and subjugated by Ilyas.

He started on his exedition against Bengal (or Lakhanawati) in Shawwal 754 A. H. (Nov. 1353 A. D.). In the course of the outward march the chiefs of Gorakhpur, Karusha (or Campārana) and Tirhut were subjugated. They paid homage to the Emperor. Arrangements were also made for the administration of the territory stretching from the rivers Saryū to the Kusi (Kośī). On the arrival of the Emperor Ilyas withdrew to Tirhut and from Tirhut to Pandua and then from Pandua to Ekdalā. The Emperor followed him, and Ilyas was later defeated. On the approach of the rainy season, Feroz by forced march returned to Delhi on 12th Shāban 755 A. H. or 1354 A. D.[1]

Firoz Tughalak re-united Tirhut and placed the kingdom in the hands of Kāmeśvara's son, Bhogīśvara. Kāmeśvara is said to have been dethroned by Feroz in 1353 A.D. Barni refers to the meeting between Kāmeśvara and the Emperor but makes no hint at his dethronement. We have, however,, references to the appointment of Qazi and Collectors in Tirhut district by Firoz on the eve of

4. cf. RS. 100, fn. 3, also pp. 91-105 ; Barni (Elliot. III. 292-94); Briggs. I. 448-51 ; HB. II. 105 & fn. 1 ; CHI. III. 176 ; Singh, 85-86 ; MDG. 20 ; Annals, xxxv. 121 ; Al Badaoni, I, pp. 309, 317, 324 ; JBRS. XL. pt. ii, pp. 99-100 ; cf. **Supra**, 291 ff.

his departure for Delhi.[1] This move on the part of the Emperor definitely shows that he had lost his confidence in Kāmeśvara. Hence the appointment of Bhogīśvara. The Tughlak campaign thus put an end to the independent status of the Maithila kings who were henceforward completely subjugated to the Delhi throne.

The Kāmeśvara dynasty, however, continued to rule over Tirhut till early in the 16th century A. D. Here, as elsewhere the Muhammadan conquest passed over the land without sweeping away all the land-marks. The Hindu rulers of Tirhut were practically independent so long as they acknowledged their submission to the Muhammadans by paying an annual tribute. Their tenure of power, solely depended on the pleasure of their Mohammadan over-lords.[2]

Though the northern part of Tirhut was ruled by its native princes, the southern part was under the direct control of the Muhammadan Governors. The Muhammadan supremacy was far more pronounced in that region. Hajipur, the heaquarters of the Muslim governors of Bengal kings was a scene of more than one rebellion. It constituted an important strategic position. Al Badāoni says that Haji Ilyas, the founder of the city, built the greater number of forts, which the infidels (i. e. non-Muslims or Hindus) had destroyed in Tirhut.[3] The town of Hajipur was also fortified by Ilyas. He built

1. RS. 100, fn. 3 ; Tārikh-i-Firozshahi (Pers. Text), 586, MDG. 20 ; Rahmani, op. cit. p. 6; cf. **Supra** 292.
2. MDG. 19; also cf. Mitra-Majumdar, Vidyāpati, 35.
3. Muntakhabu-t-Tawarikh, Vol. I. pp. 348-49 (1898 Ed.).

strong fortress there and afterwards rebelled against Emperor Firoz Tughlak and was consequently defeated and crushed.[1] In its neighbourhood the Muhammadan ascendency was worn and maintained through wars and convulsions. As a result the Musalmans have left many more traces in this region than they have in the north,

Towards the end of Firoz Tughlak's reign forces of disintegration again raised their heads. Various princes and chiefs took advantage of this situation. It was during this period of lawlessness that one Arslāna killed Gaṇeśa or Gaṇeśvara, the brother and successor of Bhogīśvara in L. S. 252 (1371–72 A. D.). The frontiers of the Tughlak empire were made secure by placing them under great Amirs and well-wishers of the emperor. The fief of Bihar was granted to Malik Bir Afgan,[2] who might have taken advantage of this situation and extended his influence up to Tirhut. The identity of Arslān, therefore, must yet remain a problem.[3]

In 796 A. H. (1396 A. D.) the fief of Bihar and Tirhut was granted to eunuch Malik Sarvar Khwaja Jahan, by Sultan Mahmud Tughlak, the grand son of Firoz Tughlak. He proceeded as far as Jainagar and acquired a large number of elephants and much valuable property. Sultan Mahmūd Tughlak conferred on his Vazir (Khwaja Jahan) the title of Malik–ush–Sharq and appointed him Governor of Jaunpur, Bihar and Tirhut (eastern provinces of the

1. RS. 98-103.
2. JASB. (N. S.) xxvi. 262-63; JBRS. XL. 103; Elliot, iv. 13.
3. cf. Kīrttilatā, pallava 2; Mitra-Majumdar, Vidyāpati, 30; JBRS. XL. 102-03; Vidyālaṅkāra, Itihāsa-praveśa, 326.

empire), and later the Vazir taking advantage of the disorder at Delhi, assumed the title of Sultan-ush-Sharq. He betrayed his sovereign and established himself at Jaunpur as an independent ruler in 796 A. H.[1]

He held his sway over Oudh and the Gangetic Doāb and right into Bihar and Tirhut to the East. He died in A. H. 802 after a short reign of six years and some months.[2]

The year c. 1392-1402 A. D. was a critical period in the history of Mithilā. It was sacked by different Muslim invaders. For a considerable period there seems to have prevailed chaos and lawlessness there. The extention of Khwaja Jahan's influence in Tirhut dreaded Vīrasiṃha and Kīrttisiṃha who sought help from the decaying Tughlak empire, when they failed in their mission in Bengal. The desperate princes at last appealed to Ibrahim Shah of the rising Sharqi kingdom of Jaunpur to help redress their grievānces. Ibrahim was then involved in a war with Delhi (1405 - 1416 A. D.).[3] It is, therefore, probable that Ibrahim came to Tirhut some time in 1402 A, D., defeated and killed the so-called Arslān, referred to above, and crowned Kīrttisiṃha as the king of Mithilā. From this time till 1460 A.D. Tirhut constituted more or less a vassal state of the Jaunpur kingdom.[4]

1. Lane-poole, The Mohammadan Dynasties, 309; CHI. III. 701; Thomas, Chronicles of the Pathan Kings, 320; Elliot IV (Tarikh-i- Mubarakshahī). p. 29; Singh, 87.
2. JBORS xxviii. 290; also cf. Elliot. Iv. 29; Datta, "Introduction to Bihar," Patna, 1946, p. 19; CHI. III. 251; Cambridge Shorter History of India, 262.
3. Briggs iv. chap. VII.
4. cf. **Supra**. 297--301.

Śivasiṃha, the successor of Padmasiṃha, is said to have declared independence and issued gold coins. He is also represented as having won victory against some Muslim kings whose names we do not know. The first half of the 15th century again witnessed the process of political disintegration. Timur had come and gone, and Delhi had just heaved a sigh of relief. Ibrahim Shah was busy with fighting against Delhi from 1405 to 1416 A. D. Bengal was passing through political convulsions. This was, therefore, a very opportune moment for a brave and ambitious king like Śivasiṃha to take a bold step and assert his independence. Saif-ud-din Hamja Shah, Siha-bu-d-din Bayazid Shah, Allauddin Firoz Shah and Gaṇeśa alias Danujamarddanadeva were the contemporary Gauḍa kings of Śivasiṃha.[1]

This bold attempt on the part of Śivasiṃha and his independent disposition ultimately brought him into conflict with Ibrahim Shah. Ibrahim Shah did not come personally as he was busy otherwise. His representative, who had been deputed to suppress the rising in Bengal, attacked and defeated Śivasiṃha on his return (818 A.H.). With his defeat and death the last of the great Hindu kings of North-eastern India disappeared.

From this time onward Tirhut and Bihar remained subject to the Jaunpur kings for about 100 years,[2] till

cf. JBRS, XL. pt. ii, 114; Mitra-Majumdar, Vidyāpati, 36-37 Majumdār thinks that Sivasiṃha helped Gaṇeśa in suppressing Hamja Shah (p. 37). For a contrary view, cf. JBRS. XL. pt. ii, 115-18.

RS. 114; Thomas, Chronicles of the Pathan Kings of Delhi, 365.

the invasion of the Lodis. Towards the end of the 15th century the kings of Jaunpur had grown much stronger than the Delhi Emperor. Ibrahim's son Mahmūd Shah (1440-57) attacked Delhi several times. Shah Alam (1444–51), the last king of the Sayyid Dynasty, left Delhi for Badaun to live peacefully. He also gave his sister in marriage to Husain, the younger brother of Mahmūd Shah to escape their frequent attacks. When he did not return from Badaun, the *amirs* and courtiers crowned Bahlol Lodi on the throne of Delhi. With his accession began the Lodi-Sharqi-struggle, which finally ended in the defeat and dismemberment of the Sharqi kingdom.

In the beginning Bahlol Lodi had to bear tha brunt of the Sharqi attacks. He was reduced to a miserable status. His offer of peace-terms was totally ignored by Mahmūd and later his brother Husain (1458–1479). Bahlol was, however, able to defeat the Sultan of Jaunpur in 1479 A.D. [1]

3. Nāsiruddin Mahmūd I (1442-59), one of the later Ilyās Shahis of Bengal also ruled over Bhagalpur, for among the mint-towns and sites of inscriptions of his reign are Bhagalpur, Sātgaon & etc. (vide- HB. II. 132).

The mention of Jor and Barur (the latter identified with a parganah of the name in the Purnea district) in a Dinajpur Inscription of Ruknuddin Barbak's reign (the king of Bengal, 1459-1474 A.D.) dated 1460 indicates the extent of his dominions north of the Gangā. It appears that Bhagalpur had acknowledged his father's (Nāsiruddin Mahmūd I's) rule but the districts west of Munger lay within the Jaunpur kingdom as is proved by Mahmūd Sharqi's inscriptions found in the Bihar districts. (HB. II. 135).

In 1494 A.D. with the accession of Sikandar Lodi, the son and successor of Emperor Bahlol Lodi, the Sharqi-Lodi-war reached its climax. Sikandar completely defeated Husain Shah Sharqi of Jaunpur near Patna and sent him flying for refuge to Bengal. The Jaunpur kingdom was annexed to the Lodi Empire which now extended up to the border of Bihar. He had thus occupied Patna, Tirhut and Saran and Champaran.[1] "This was a situation which no ruler of Bengal could view with equanimity for an aggressive power established in a province which controlled the entrance to Bihar and Bengal would contribute a dire threat to her security."[2] Alauddin Husain (1493-1519 A.D.), the king of Bengal, therefore, allowed Husain Shah Sharqi to cross the frontier into Kahalgāon (Colgong in Bhagalpur) and received him with full honour.[3] Sikandar also grasped the grave situation and decided on taking immediate action. In 1495 A.D. he moved on to Tughlakpur on the Bengal frontier and prepared for invasion. Husain (of Bengal) had also foreseen such a contingency.

1. Sheikh Rajkula Mustaki in his book **Wakiat-i-Mushtaki** gives a suceint account of Camparan which formed a part of Tirhut in the reign of Sikandar Lodi (1489 1517 A.D.) Mian Husain Farmuli was then the jagirdar of Saran and Camparan. Farmuli had taken no less than 20,000 villages from the Hindus. The Afghans attacked the Rājā of Camparan under the leadership of Farmuli, sacked the country, indiscriminately plundered its riches and treasuries and totally destroyed the kingdom (Vide- Elliot, IV. 546-47; CDG. 24; Singh,, 89).
2. HB. II 145.
3. RS. 135.

He at once sent an army under his son Dāniyal, and the two armies stood face to face at Barh (Munger). On Sikandar's instructions, however, a non-aggressive agreement was entered into. Dāniyal agreed not to give shelter to Sikandar's enemies.[1] It was also agreed that Sikandar should retain Bihar, Tirhut and Sarkar Saran, on condition that he would not invade Bengal. He then swept over Tirhut. The Rājā was unable to face the Imperial forces and agreed to make terms on the payment of a heavy fine amounting to several lakhs of rupees. This rājā was probably Rāmabhadra alias *Rūpanārāyaṇa*, the fourteenth

1. From the sequel, however, this clause does not appear to have affected Husain Sharqi's continual residence at Kahalgaon where he died (cf HB. 145-46; CHI. III. 271; Lane- poole, op. cit. 3o9; JBORS XXVIII. 290-95). The line of demarcation is also not mentioned. Sikandar subsequently conferred the district round Tughlakpur on Azam Humāyūn, while Bihar became the **iqta'** of Daryā Khan Lohani (Badaoni I. 319). That Husain's control extended to within a few miles of Patna in south Bihar is proved by inscriptions found in Munger and Bihar. This was soon followed by his occupation of the whole of North Bihar includiug the Trans- Gaṇḍaka area. This is proved by his inscription at Saran (JASB. 1874. p. 304). A later inscription dated 909 A.H. or 1503-04 A.D. was found at the same place, bearing Husain's name. The occupation was either in accordance with the terms of the treaty or as a result of military operations started immediately on Sikandar's withdrawal(HB. II. 146; RS.59 fn. 1 94 fn.1 Tarikh-i,Firozshahi, 451, 586; CHI. III. 255).

king of the line. He ruled over Mithilā in 1495 A.D. when the *Gaṅgā- kṛtya-viveka* was composed.[1]

It appears that the treaty concluded between Sikandar and the Bengal king Alauddin Husain at Barh was not observed for long. After about thirty years Nusrat Shah (1519–32), son and successor of Allauddin Husain entered into an active alliance with the Eastern rebels-the Lohanis (by 1522 A.D. the Lohani State was already set up in Bihar) and the Farmulis—and received a large territorial share when the Eastern provinces fell off from Ibrahim's control. The Lodi Empire had already begun to crack and the country from Jaunpur to Patna had been appropriated by the Lohanis and the Farmulis. In this division of share, to Nusrat fell the districts north of the Tons river. He attacked Tirhut, put its rājā (Lakṣmīnātha alias *Kaṃsanārāyaṇa*) to death and placed it under his brother-in-law Alauddin.[2] He thus extended his kingdom across the river Gogra into the district of Azamgarh in the United provinces, which is proved by his Inscription of Sikandarpur, Azamgarh, dated 933 A.H.[3]

Nusrat then marched against Hajipur, subdued the tract and placed it in charge of his another brother-in-law Makhdum Alam.[4] Thus the whole of Tirhut was subju-

1. C.M. Duff, Chronology of India (1899), p. 266; Muntakhabat--t-Tawarikh by Al Badaoni (Trans. Ranking, 1898 Ed.), Vol. I. 415-17 , Tarikh-i-Khan Jahan Lodi (Elliot, V. 95-96); Makhzan -i-Afghani (Trans. Dorn, 1829 Ed.), pt. i, 59 ;pt. ii, 96 ; CDG. 23.
2. RS. 134 ff; CHI. III. 272; HB. II, 153.
3. JASB. 1873, pp. 296. 97; 1872, p. 332.
4. RS. 136; CHI. III. 272; MDG. 21.

gated. With the death of Lakṣmīnātha the last remnant of the Hindu kingdom was blotted out of the map of India.

After the death of Nusrat, Makhdum Alam revolted against Mahmud Shah, son of Nusrat Shah in about the year 1538 A.D. and joined hands with the Pathan adventurer Sher Khan (Sher Shah)[1] of Sasram (in the district of Shahabad) who was at that time beginning the struggle which finally secured for him the throne of Delhi.

The first battle of Panipat (1526 A.D.) had meanwhile uprooted the Lodis and established the Mughals under Babar firmly on the soil of India. Babar was now on the throne of Delhi, and the anti-Mughal confederacy of the Afghans, Pathans and the Lohanis had already started. Sher Khan had meanwhile seized the Bihar kingdom from powerless Jalal. Within a month, however, he submitted to Babar.[2] This proved fatal and the coalition against the Mughals completely collapsed Nusrat's policy failed and soon afterwards his political and military defeat was complete.[3]

Nusrat's younger brother and king of Bengal,Ghiyasuddin Mahmud (1533-38 A.D.) immediatly droue into open hostlity with Makhdum, the governor of Hajipur who had opposed his accession and placed his own son Alauddin Firoz (1532-33 A.D.) to the throne of Bengal. He despatched the governor of Monghyr, Qutb Khan in

1. Ferishta (Briggs. Vol. I, pp. 537, 553, 555, 560 572); Al Badaoni (Ranking's Trans.) Vol I. pp. 469-70.
2. Babur. III, 663 -4, 659, 676.
3. cf. CHI. IV I7 ff; HB. II. 153-57.

1533 for "conquering the country of Bihar."[1] Makhdum had already allied himself with Sher Khan, the deputy-ruler of Bihar and prepared for rebellion. The battle, however, went against Makhdum and he was slain. Consequently Jalal and his supporters crossed the frontier on the pretex of leading their army into Bengal and accepted Mahmud's vassalage.

Mahmud now prepared against Sher Khan and early in 1534 A. D. a powerful army in command of Ibrahim Khan accompanied by the Lohani king moved out of Monghyr. After a month Sher Khan came out and offered a battle in the narrow plain of Surajgarh, a few miles east of Barh. Mahmud's army was routed. Ibrahim was slain and Jalal made an ignominious flight to his protector[2]. The battle is a landmark in the history of Muslim India as it helped Sher Khan to attain to supreme powers.

Babar has left in his **Memoirs** a list of countries subject to him and their approximate revenues. Tirhut (No. 23) appears in this list. Its Rājā is said to have paid a tribute of 250,000 silver taṅkās and 2,750,000 black taṅkās or at 10 per silver taṅkā 275,000, in all 525,000 silver taṅkās.

Babar says : "the countries from Bhīra to Bahār which are now under my dominion yield a revenue of 52 crores" of taṅkās. In the detail of the returns from different provinces, Tirhut is noticed as tribute *(Khidmatānā)* of the "Tirhuti Rājāh 250,000 *taṅkāh nūkrah* and

1. RS. 140; HB. II. 160.
2. HB. II. 161; Abbas, 339-42; CHI. III. 273-74.

2,750,000 *tankāh siāh*."[1] He has also mentioned his income from Bihar separately from that of Ziparam which is now taken to mean Champaran[2].

Son of an humble assignee Sher Khan rose by successive steps to be the tutor and guardian of Jalal Khan Lohani, the minor ruler of Bihar, and finally became the master of that kingdom in 1534 A. D.[3] His rise thereafter was rapid and striking. He conquered Bengal in Oct. 1539 A. D. (946 A. H.), after having defeated Humayun in the historic battle of Chausa in 1539 A. D. The battle of Bilgram finally transferred the sceptre of India to the hands of the Afghans.

Sher Shah ruled for a period of only 5 years (1540-45 A. D.). Tirhut in his time constituted one of the several sarkars into which the kingdom was divided. After the death of Sher Shah, Islam Shah (1545-1553 A. D.) ascended the throne of Delhi. During this time Muhammad Khan Sur (952 A. H. or 1545 A. D.) ruled wisely and benificently over Bengal and North Bihar[4]. After the death of Islam Shah (30th Oct. 1553) came the dissolution of the new Afghan Empire and "Bengal was one of its first limbs to break off."[5] Islam's son Firoz was murdered by Sher

1. William Erskine, History of India under Babar and Humayun Vol. I. 540; Leyden, Memoirs of Baber, 334; JASB, 1867, pt. i p. 13; Thomas, Chronicles of the Pathan Kings, 391; JASB. 1915 (N.S.), p. 431; CHI. IV. 17 ff, 22.
2. Tuzuk-i-Babari, Elliot. IV. 262.
3. CHI. IV. 45-46; JBORS. VII. 45-47.
4. RS. 148, fn. 3.
5. HB. II. 179.

Shah's nephew Mubariz Khan, who siezed the sceptre under the the title of Muhammad Shah 'Ādil (popularly called 'Ādilī'). But Ādil was too weak to control the turbulent Afghan nobles, who fell out amongst themselves and most of them mutually slaughtered. Of the survivors, many fled away and broke out in open rebellion in their respective provinces.[1]

The Sur viceroy of Bengal at this time (1553) was Muhammad Khan of the same clan. He also declared his independence under the title of Shamsuddin Muhammad Shah Ghāzi. He occupied Jaunpur and advanced towards Agra. He was, however, slain by Himu, the royal general of Ādilī (Dec. 1555). Ādilī appointed Shahbaz Khan as his governor of Bengal. Soon afterwards Shamsuddin's son Khizr Khan crowned himself at Jhusi (opposite Allahabad) under the title of Ghiyāsuddin Bahadur Shah and captured Bengal after defeating Shahbaz Khan (1556 A. D.). He ruled over Bengal and North Bihar[2] for about a period of seven years.

Meanwhile Humayun had recovered the Panjab and Delhi from Afghan Sultan Sikandar Sur. Humayun died on 26th Jan. 1556. His son, Akbar crowned himself as the Emperor of Delhi three weeks later. Then came the final trial of arms when at Panipat on the 5th of November, 1556 Ādilī's general Himu was defeated and slain and the Mughal sceptre placed beyond challenge. Ādilī himself was defeated and slain by the Bengal Sultan Ghiyāsuddin Bahadur Shah at the village of Fathpur, 4 miles west of

1. Ibid; Makh. 102-08.
2. RS 148, fn. 1.

Surjagarh (April, 1557).[1] Later in a fight Bahadur Shah was also defeated and plundered by the Mughal general Khan-i-Jahan.

His brother Jalal Shah alias Ghiyāsuddin II succeeded him on the throne (1560). He never provoked the Mughal empire, but he always maintained a precarious position due to the restless turbulence and duplicity of the Karrani family "who had wrested a home for themselves in Bengal and Bihar". Ghiyāsuddin died in 1563 A. D. and was succeeded by his son who was soon murdered by one Ghiyāsuddin III. The latter was also killed by Taj Khan Karrani and thus the sceptre of Bengal and North Bihar passed into the hands of the Karrani family.[2]

Taj Khan and his brother Sulaiman Karrani gained possession of much of western Bengal (Gaur) in addition to the south-eastern districts of Bihar "which had fallen into a state of anarchy owing to the internal internecine wars among the new kingless Afghan chiefs".[3]

Sulaiman Karrani reigned for eight years (1565–1572)- He ruled independently over Bengal and Bihar.[4] He held Bihar from the time of Sher Shah. He was very shrewd and diplomatic and always cared to avoid giving the least offence to Akbar's viceroys on his western border like Khān-i-Zamān and Khān-i-Khānan by means of friendly communications and rich presents.[5] He had also Akbar's

1. RS. 148
2. Ibid. 148-56; AK, ii, 477.
3. Makh. 116-20.
4. RS. 152 ff.
5. HB. II. 182.

name read from the pulpit as his suzerain and himself never sat on the throne nor stamped his coins. He died on 11th October 1572. A. D.[1]

Muhammad Shah was the last independent king of Bengal. After him the Delhi crown appointed several governors from time to time to rule over Tirhut. North Bihar now formed a part of the Delhi Empire. The allegiance of its chieftains was, however, very loose. The country had not been fully subjugated and it was filled with Afghan settlers. Their numbers were swelled by those Pathans who had refused to join the services of the Mughals. When Dāud Khan was raised to the throne of Bengal (1574 A. D.) after the death of his brother Sulaiman Karrani, he wanted to be completely independent of the Delhi crown. He found a number of trained Pathan soldiers ready to espouse his cause.

It is interesting to note that in the time of Dāud Khan Karrani, Gujar Khan, the supreme general of the Afghans, set up the son of Bāyazid in Bihar. Dāud despatched Ludi Khan from Bengal against the pretender. Meanwhile Mughal general Muni'm (Khan-i-Khānan) was ordered by Emperor Akbar to march on to Bihar to take possession of that province. Ludi and Gujar soon made up their quarrel and bought Muni'm Khan off with two lakhs of rupees and other goods and precious things as tribute from Dāud who was then at Hajipur. They also made delusive promises of loyalty. The matter was thus peacefully settled. After concluding peace Dāud now established himself in the fort of Patna.[2]

1. RS. 153
2. Al Badaoni (Trans. by Lowe), Vol. II. 176-78; HB. II. 185 ff; AN (Elliot-Dowson), 41-46.

After his Gujrat-conquest Akbar, however, sent re-inforcements to Muni'm Khan. The Mughal army was sent by land-route. Akbar himself set off from Agra by the river Gaṅgā. The Emperor encamped near Patna. A picked army of 3000 fully equipped horsemen under Khan-i-Azam was despatched in boats across the Gaṅgā, for taking the fortress of Hajipur whence aid used to come to Dāud's men at Patna. Rājā Kachiti[1] was appointed to assist Khan-i-Azam. Akbar personally saw the fight from the other bank of the Gaṅgā. Fath Khan Barha was the commander of the Afghan army of Dāud. On the 6th August, 1574, however, Hajipur was stormed and taken after a few hours of bloody fighting. Soon afterwards Gajapati, a zamindar of Hajipur and Patna, who had been subjugated, revolted and was eventually subdued and crushed.[2] Those chieftains who had assisted in maintaining the imperial authority were granted lands and *jāgirs* in the Hajipur sarkar and there they settled down with their followers.

The Mughals under Todar Mal then followed up Dāud. On the 3rd March 1575 the contending forces met at Tukaroi. The battle was a decisive victory for the Mughals though many of their high officers were slain and wounded. Dāud fled to Katak. On 12th April he came out of fort and made complete submission to the Khān-i-Khānan. Later, on the 10th July 1576 he was taken prisoner and beheaded by Khān-i-Jahān.[3]

1. TA. (Elliot V, 377) has **Gajapati**.
2. cf. Al Badaoni, II. 182-83, 244-45; Ak. iii, 150-53; RS. 154, fn. 2; HB. II. 185-86; MDG. 21.
3. Ak. iii, 183-86; TN. 326; RS. 154, 157, 158, 160, 161; Al Badaoni, II. 180-81.

INDEX

C

D

O

P

S

T

U

CORRIGENDA

Page No	Line No.	For	Read
1	8	persuits	pursuits
6	fn. 3	eastwar	eastward
19	fn. 1	collceted	collected
38	fn. 8	idehva	Videha
40	fn. 1	Ipid	Ibid
40	fn. 1	lāṭyāyani	Lāhyāyani
40	fn. 1	Pārisṣitas	Pārīkṣitas
40	fn. 3	Aupals	Annals
45	15	Pārīkṣita	Parīkṣita
57	12	accordonce	accordance
79	fn. 1	Sivate	Sivali
80	24	me at	meat
97	3	extreme by	extremely
137	20	asteachers	as teachers
189	16	Pāṭaligupta	Pāṭaliputra
198	fn. 4	Compaign	Campaign
208	22	Compaign	Campaign
282	5	persued	pursued
288	19	Mṛcchakaṭīkā	Mṛcchakaṭika
348	3	cf	of
350	26	devided	divided
360	22	betrayig	betraying
361	26	Adikāramālā	Adhikāramālā
364	20	hatered	hatred
371	26	Kiuds	Kinds
378	fn. 4	2	4
394	13	'Iwas	'Iwaz
408	8	exedition	expedition
41 4	fn. 1	suceint	succinct

1. Books are issued for 15 days only but may have to be recalled earlier if urgently required.
2. An over-due charge of 25 Paise per day per volume will be charged.
3. Books may be renewed on request, at the discretion of the Librarian.
4. Periodicals, Rare and Reference books may not be issued and may be consulted only in the Library.
5. Books lost, defaced or injured in any way shall have to be replaced or its double price shall be paid by the borrower.